22. A. 526

BOSTON MEDICAL LIBRARY

PURCHASED FROM THE INCOME OF THE

OLIVER F. WADSWORTH FUND

A

PLAIN STATEMENT

OF

AUTHENTICATED FACTS

RESPECTING THE SYSTEM

FOR THE

PREVENTION AND REMOVAL

OF

DISEASE

INVENTED AND PRACTISED

BY

JOHN ST. JOHN LONG, ESQ.

M.R.S.L. M.R.A.S.

"No man deserves a monument who could not be wrapped in a winding-sheet of papers written against him."—POPE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

AND SOLD BY

W. SPOONER, 259, REGENT-STREET CIRCUS, OXFORD-STREET.

MDCCCXXXIV.

13269 .75 Wed

PRINTED BY RICHARD TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

TO THOSE

NUMEROUS PATIENTS

WHO HAVE ATTESTED THE BENEFITS THEY HAVE DERIVED FROM HIS SYSTEM,

THIS VOLUME

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY THEIR

FAITHFUL AND OBEDIENT SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

IN the following pages it has been my object to lay before the reader such a statement of the facts which support my system for the removal of disease as may serve to convince him that it is not liable to the reproach of being either visionary or empirical.

That disease originates in an acrid humour, which in some cases suspends or deranges the functions, and in others injures or destroys the structure of those organs upon which vital action depends, is, I think, more or less directly asserted or admitted by various eminent medical writers, many of whose works have been published long before I was born, or whose writings have been dictated by anything rather than a desire to uphold my peculiar system. I may therefore, I think, take that most important point for granted; at least, I may claim that *I alone* ought not to bear any odium that may arise from the maintenance of a position which I only hold in common with the most eminent physicians, anatomists, and physiologists of this or any other country. That

such an acrid humour exists, is the foundation of my system of cure; and that I possess a remedial agent, by the application of which it may be extracted, and disease thus removed, constitutes the ground, and the only ground, of any claim that I may possess upon the confidence of the public.

In order to show the validity of such a claim, I beg leave to refer the reader to the various documentary evidence by which it is supported. I have now been in practice for a period of six years. During three of these years I may be said to have been suffering persecution; and *all* the cures, of which authentic statements by living and respectable witnesses appear in the following pages, have been performed within that short time. I am bold to affirm that a greater body of unsuspicious evidence never yet was laid before the public, although there are hundreds of individuals restored to health who have not given me any testimony of their recovery.

I know well that a prejudice must prevail against the pretensions of any man who asserts that he has made a great discovery, the secret of which he is unwilling to publish to the world. All that I shall say on that subject at present, is, *that my discovery is my own property*; and until all other men set the example of parting with their possessions for the public good, I know not why I should be called upon so to do. This claim upon

my benevolence has generally been made by those who have exhibited anything rather than benevolence towards me; men, in fact, who have spared no pains to injure, if not destroy me: and to these I must be permitted to say, that I am under no such obligations as should induce me to part with it without an equivalent.

There is, in the language of these gentlemen, something, as it appears to me, not only unreasonable, but inconsistent. At one time they abuse me for not making known my discovery; at another they abuse me because, as they allege, I have made no discovery. Now which of these statements is the true one? If the former, then I must say that they are wrong in the course which they have pursued; for virulence, calumny, and persecution, such as that to which I have been exposed, are not the *most seductive* means for winning my confidence; and, by the blessing of God, I never will be terrified by them into an acquiescence in the wishes of my defamers. If the latter, then I am wholly guiltless of the crime, as *they* call it, of withholding any valuable discovery from the world.

No: let the facts which I have adduced be duly weighed. Let candid men impartially examine the statements of the various witnesses whose experience has enabled them to testify in favour of my system; and if, after due allowance is made for everything which could in the least

subtract from the weight of this testimony, a strong impression is not made in favour of the reality of the cures that I have performed, then I must say that *any* testimony is utterly valueless, and that *no* system, resting upon evidence, can have a solid foundation in reason. But if the evidence which I have adduced be sufficient to prove the reality of the facts, nothing more is necessary to uphold my system.

There is one feature of my system to which I would, in a more especial manner, call the attention of the reader. *The Lotion which I use for the extraction of morbid matter will take no effect whatever upon those parts of the body which are not diseased.* Wherever disease is present, its application will attract the peccant humour to the surface, and cause it to pass away by gradual discharges, until the whole is removed; and when that object is accomplished, its continued application will only have the effect of accelerating the healing of the part from which that humour was extracted. I believe I may venture to say that this is a property not belonging to any medicine at present known to the recognised professors of the healing art in this country; and it is a property which I have in thousands of instances, and in the presence of most competent judges, many of them medical men, and all of them men of rank and education, proved, by experiment, to belong to my Lotion.

Let the reader weigh impartially the evidence I offer in support of this fact, and say whether it is possible to resist it. I will here only observe, that he is to consider it simply *as an alleged matter of fact*, respecting which, as far as it has any reality, there can be no doubt entertained by competent observers. The witnesses simply testify to what they actually saw, as well in my absence as in my presence; as well when the Lotion was used by themselves, as when it was used by my attendants; when the application of the *very same* liquid produced a discharge in one case, and could not be made to produce one in another: and how plausible soever it may be to say that the *cure* of any particular patient was effected rather by his own imagination than by my remedies, such an allegation is wholly inapplicable to cases where hundreds of individuals only testify to matters of fact, respecting which they feel as little personal interest as concerning one of the ordinary or extraordinary phenomena of nature.

It has been said by my enemies, and believed by those who only know me through their misrepresentations, that I am wholly ignorant of the human frame, never having devoted any time to anatomical investigations. This is not the case. I set out in life as an artist. In order to qualify myself for this vocation, I deemed an acquaintance with anatomy absolutely necessary, and accordingly pursued it with an assiduity which soon

put me in possession of everything important connected with that interesting department of knowledge. This is a fact which was known to several of the faculty long before I became known as a public man; and since that period I have frequently dissected subjects with a view to familiarize myself with the minutest details respecting the structure and the functions of the various parts of our animal nature, and have thus, I am bold to say, acquired a knowledge of it not inferior to that possessed by the generality of regular practitioners. My drawings of the human frame (which are open to the inspection of any gentleman who chooses to examine them, in Harley Street,) will sufficiently prove the degree of attention which I have devoted to a subject which in medical science is second to no other in importance. I mention these things not with any view to obtain for myself a fictitious celebrity. I well know that no practitioner has a right to confer a diploma upon himself. My success must depend, not upon what I may say, but upon what I have done, and what I can do. And I only allude to my proficiency in the study of anatomy, because what I have stated admits of easy proof to those who choose to inquire into it, and the contrary assertion, which has been very generally credited, has brought no small degree of discredit upon my practice. I only say, therefore, let my system be judged by its merits. And

while I desire no credit for mere declarations or professions which are unsupported by facts, it is, I think, but reasonable that I should receive as much benefit from the truth of my statement that I possess a competent knowledge of anatomy, as my enemies have derived advantages from the industrious circulation of a contradictory representation.

One word more, and I have done. I have been reproached with practising without a diploma. The fact certainly is so; but whether it be a ground of reproach, or not, is another question. The principles upon which my practice is founded differ essentially from those which are recognised by the faculty. Their mode of treating a great variety of complaints I am compelled unequivocally to condemn; I could not, therefore, with consistency, ask for, *or even accept* of a testimonial at their hands, without a virtual abandonment of my own peculiar views, and an acknowledgement of the utility of a system which I believe to be both delusive and injurious.

If, therefore, I had been one of them, my discoveries would have obliged me to come out from among them. But not having been so, it cannot be imagined that I will now betake myself to them for a testimony in favour of my qualifications. No: we are almost diametrically opposed to each other. If they are right, I am wrong; and if I am right, they are wrong. I beg to be

considered *as a dissenter* from the doctrines at present in vogue in the medical world; and I only claim the privilege, enjoyed by all other dissenters, of professing and practising in what I conceive to be the right way, as long as I continue so to do with advantage to the community.

41 Harley Street,
May, 1834.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
On the primary cause of disease	1
Evidence upon which Mr. Long rests his claims to the confidence of the country	85
On the properties of the Lotion, and its beneficial effects; with the cases of various patients	92
Extracts from evidence given before the Coroner	180
Appendix :—	
No. I.—Defence of Mr. Long, touching the death of Miss Catherine Cashin	211
No. II.—Strictures on the death of Mrs. Lloyd	254

A number of errata, particularly in the names of parties, have crept into this Volume. For these, the severe indisposition of the Author, and his absence from town whilst the Work was passing through the press, must plead his excuse with the candid reader.

EVIDENCES.

ON THE PRIMARY CAUSE OF DISEASE.

"The true principle of action in almost every antidote is affinity "for the bane or poison to be neutralized."—*Sir Humphry Davy, The Quarterly Review for April* 1833.

"I believe that surgeons must be content to say as the unlearned "do, that humours come of themselves; that is, that the cause "of their production is really unknown; *we cannot tell how they* "*happen.*"—*Mr. Lawrence's* 31 *Lectures,* 1830.

THE object of this work is to show that all the hereditary ailments of the body are produced by a virus, or putrescent substance, and a *deleterious fluid*, which I have discovered to be present in every form of disease, and which has become inherent in the human frame[1].

[1] "All the great schemes of Providence have been "unfolded gradually. If the world should last thou-"sands of ages, some new discovery will occasionally "be made from the Sacred Writings, some new de-

As to the precise time when God afflicted mankind with corporeal malady, medical historians are much in doubt[1]. Although death fell upon all men in consequence of sin, yet the virus of disease appears to have been an after-punishment, and to have cut short the natural duration of our construction in various ways, and with different degrees of severity.

" ductions will arise from the history of the dispensa-
" tions of God: latent meanings will be explained as
" the human mind advances in philosophical research."
—*Dr. Valpy's Sermons.*

" The term inflammation, when applied to disease,
" is figurative, and probably derives its origin either
" from the presence of heat as a symptom, or from an
" opinion which formerly prevailed that there is a pre-
" ternatural accumulation of fire in an inflamed part:
" with more propriety it may be considered as a tech-
" nical name, not at all designed to express the cause
" or form of the morbid affection."

" To a particular series of appearances, uniformly
" connected, is given the name of inflammation; but
" we are *unacquainted with that specific morbid alter-*
" *ation* in which the several phænomena necessarily
" exist in a combined state."

" The nature of pus, and the mode of its formation,
" hath given occasion to great diversity of sentiment."
—*Pearson, On Surgery.*

[1] " How the small-pox could at first have originated,
" sets all conjecture at defiance."—*Dr. Ainslie.* See
Transactions of the " Royal Asiatic Society."

It is not my object at present to dwell on the various forms which disease assumed in the early ages, and on the influence medical agents may have had in changing its character and action; but I shall reserve these points for the subject of another work.

It shall be my business here to submit the analysis of disease in its various forms[1], paying no attention whatever to past or present theories or opinions[2], confidently submitting that what-

---

[1] "It were better for medicine, like other branches "of natural knowledge, to be brought from its hiding-"place, and exhibited in the simplicity of science and "the nakedness of truth."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

[2] "If some assert that disorder is general, while "others contend for its local and partial origin or es-"sence,—if one individual refers you to the stomach, "and another to the brain, and another to the fine "membrane which lines internal surfaces, as the parts "upon which disordered impulse directs primarily and "principally its operations,—what security am I to "have, might the lay oppugner of our science say, "that any of these principles or propositions are cor-"rect or substantiable? And with respect to the prac-"tical inferences which are drawn from them, how "awfully distant from the right point may that phy-"sician be who is forming his remedial indications "from an erroneously conceived locality; who is sup-"posing the malady partial, when it is, in fact, uni-

ever I may state, I am at all times prepared to prove by experiments; and with these data I shall proceed, avoiding all abstruse and unnecessary terms; but to make myself the better understood, I will draw the curtain of mystery aside[1],

---

" versal; or who is looking into the liver, when he " ought to be considering the brain!

* * * * *

" Thus it may be seen how likely *error is to assail* " *us on all sides,* unless we duly recognise the peculiar " nature and limits of our art and science. The meta- " physical, abstract, nosological physician prescribes " by rule, in defiance of recognition, and practises upon " principles that have an imaginary base; the organic " theorist limits his observations to a part, when he " should be taking a survey of the whole; the hasty " generalizer is mischievously regardless of parts and " peculiarities; and the morbid anatomist can never " be brought to appreciate anything but structural " and inflammatory ailment."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

[1] " Now it is manifest that in the same proportion " that it is the interest of low pretenders to keep the " world in ignorance of those matters, it is that of well- " educated and scientific physicians that it should be " enlightened. Nevertheless, I fear that the latter have " not acted on that principle, and that they still affect " a mystery in their proceedings, and show an unwill- " ingness to communicate the information sought of " them by their patients or their friends, which is not " only in itself disgusting and ridiculous, but calcu-

and show by facts, and the most conclusive deductions, what disease really is[1].

For example, the organs of the body have certain functional duties to perform for the support of life, all differing from each other in their secreting and absorbing offices. Notwithstanding this perfect and wonderful ordinance of nature, we find in the body a *matter*, a *fluid*, or a *substance*, which will not yield to the secreting office of any of these organs, but remains in the system, operating in defiance of her laws; and not only so, but impeding the secretions, debilitating and causing erosion of the organs, and consequently undermining the constitution[2].

"lated to do injury to themselves and to the cause of "science.

* * * * *

"The whole system appears to be constructed with "a view to baffle inquiry, and to envelop this matter "of qualification in the same mystery and confusion "that cover every other circumstance regarding the "medical profession."—*Dr. Morrison, Medicine no "Mystery*, 1829.

[1] "We know nothing of the poison itself, but only "its effects on the human body. It is commonly in "the form of pus, or united with pus, or some such "secretion, and produces a similar matter."—*John Hunter.*

[2] "The ancient doctrine of temperaments was ob-"jectionable, because it did not sufficiently recognise "these endless mixtures, and because it assumed the

It is just to infer, that all this calamity takes place in consequence of there not being any organ for removing *that* matter or fluid: *had there been* such, the operations of health would not be obstructed, and life could be preserved free from disease. *Again, if the diseased matter*

" existence of a something tangible,—a *materies* upon " which the difference in constitution is founded. We " actually know nothing beyond the fact of varied sus- " ceptibility; we are still ignorant of the cause upon " which the variety depends. And so we are in respect " to the *modus operandi*, as it is technically termed, of " medicine; or the precise principle upon which re- " storative agency is effected. Metaphysics and phy- " sics, and reasoning founded on a rejection of either, " have all in vain been tried to explain the manner in " which medicinals operate. Chemistry will not do; " for, although we may take any fluid from the body, " whether natural or the result of disorder, and subject " it to the strictest analysis which modern science is " capable of effecting; and although we shall have " found the something which, taken from or added to, " out of the body, will change a morbid fluid into a " healthy one, we cannot operate this subtraction or " addition *in* the body. There is a something between " us and our endeavours which in all cases modifies, " in most cases nullifies, the experiment; and this is " the case with the solids as well as the fluids. The " bones, for example, are mainly constituted of phos- " phate of lime, as ascertained by chemical analysis. " Now we find in some instances, of children's dis-

were necessary to life, there would have been an organ both for its formation and removal.

As a further proof that the humour and deleterious fluid are alone the cause of disease[1], let us observe the operations of Nature, while contending with disease in the infant age, at a period,

---

" orders especially, that the essence of the ailment " consists in a deficiency of bony formation. We " want, in fact, more phosphate of lime in the bones, " but we cannot, by throwing this material into the " stomach, or injecting it by the rectum, or introducing " it directly into the blood-vessels, or applying it to " the open mouths of absorbents, supply the demand. " No, the effect can only be remedied by bringing the " living energy into that state in which it shall have " power to manufacture, as it were, from the blood the " wanted material; or, perhaps we might say, by bring- " ing the blood into a condition of supplying the ma- " terial."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

Will poison, counter-irritants, or blood-letting, do this? Surely not! Nothing but removing the primary cause, the deleterious fluid.—J. St. J. L.

[1] " I have all along considered inflammation as the " disease, and suppuration only as a consequence of " that disease, and have supposed the disease to be " gone when suppuration has taken place; but ac- " cording to the common opinion, suppuration was the " thing to be wished for, *because all diseases arose from* " *humours*; but as we have not once mentioned hu- " mours, and therefore *made it no part of our system,* " *we must* also drop it."—*John Hunter, On the Blood.*

too, when we should naturally expect to find the body more than ever free from ailment; but, on the contrary, we find it not only labouring under the excitement of malady, but endeavouring to expel the foreign body by the most powerful efforts. And because no organ possesses the power of conveying it away by an allotted channel, the virus is thrown to the surface ready to leave the body, and I affirm that it *would* do so *effectually* if assisted[1]. That *this* may be clearly understood, I respectfully invite those who may be interested in the subject, to satisfy themselves of these facts by a visit to Harley-street, where they

---

[1] "Where an abscess is deeply seated in some important part of the body, so that it is of consequence to the welfare of the patient that it be conducted speedily to maturation, and that the pus be evacuated at an external opening, heating and stimulating applications may be used with propriety; as substances containing turpentine, resins, the warm gums, cantharides, or acrid vegetables. * * *

"Very frequently the spontaneous rupture of an abscess may be permitted; sometimes it must be insisted upon; but it will also in many cases be prudent, or even absolutely necessary, to discharge the matter contained in it by an artificial opening." —*Pearson, On Surgery.*

This important object I have always accomplished in my practice, and that too without breaking the skin, and the result in nineteen cases out of twenty has been restoration to health of the patients.

will see the practice in operation on my patients, and they will then be convinced that the *same* virus and deleterious fluid which appear in different forms, and produce different effects[1], can be removed by the properties of ONE remedy, varied in its application, as the case may require.

It is therefore fair to infer, that as one remedy removes the various ailments of the body, and these ailments can be reduced to the same deleterious fluid and virus that produced them, there can be no other *foundation for our hereditary ailments than the virus and deleterious fluid*[2].

---

[1] "In the third Lecture at the College I have endeavoured to show how *dissimilar*, or much diversified, diseases may result from the same general causes.—*Abernethy*.

[2] ". . . . We are compelled to give up the doctrine of excitement, or stimulation, and adopt, in a sort of empirical or confused way, the conclusions of those men who talked about the humours of the body, or who conceived that in the blood and fluids was to be found the essence of disease, as well as the principle of life, and that curative agency is resolvable into a something of change brought about in them.

"But that the humoral doctrines of medicine are themselves also fallible, may be proved by a variety of examples. Who shall say what is added to, or abstracted from, any of the body's fluids, when in a moment mere mental impulse shall so change the whole man, that from a healthy or sane, he plunges at once into a diseased or insane state; his thoughts and his

In further confirmation of this assertion, let the virus extracted from small-pox pustule, boil, abscess, tubercle of the lungs, cancer, and the other humours I extract from scrofulous affections, spinal complaints, diseased liver, gout, and the disease called insanity, be placed on different glasses, and given to a chemist, and I venture to affirm that he cannot discover the classification of any of them[1].

Upon what basis, then, I inquire, are the dif-

"feelings, and his actions and his countenance, being "at complete variance with his former self; and withal, "having some of the secretions of his body, which be-"fore were without any offensive odour, now offensive "in the extreme?"—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

All this happens in consequence of the deleterious fluids being excited and roused into action.—J. St. J. L.

[1] "To assert that surgery and physic are essentially "distinct, is to say that there are two kinds of patho-"logy; that the external and internal parts are to be "treated on different principles. It would be as ra-"tional to say that there are two kinds of physiology, "one for the outside, another for the inside of the body.

"When you know that the component tissues, or the "organic elements of our frame, are the same through-"out, can you suppose that the position of a part in "the body can alter the nature and treatment of dis-"ease? It may cause difference in the mode of pro-"ceeding; thus, you cannot act locally on internal "parts. It may make the pathological investigation "of one organ more difficult or easy than that of an-

ferent classes of ailment founded, and upon what principle do the innumerable supposed classes of disease depend for existence? After having sufficiently shown that a humour, and a deleterious fluid *only*, are the primary causes of disease, it shall be my business, before I speak on small-pox and other forms of ailment, to prove that disease cannot be perfectly removed by any other principle, or law, than that of affinity[1], through which alone mankind may be released from hereditary ailments.

"other, but it cannot alter the essential principles. "Inflammation, for instance, is the same kind of dis-"turbance, whether in an internal or external part; "and we treat it exactly on the same principles, "whether it be in the eye, breast, or t——s, in the "heart, lungs, or liver."—*Mr. Lawrence's First Lecture.*

"When we come to examine the body, we find dis-"seminated, frequently throughout the internal organs, "the same kind of depositions as those which consti-"tuted the original tumour; tubercles in the liver, in "the lungs, in the brain, and in the bones, of a soft "substance, more or less tinged with blood, exhibiting "various hues, and differing only from the depositions "in cancer by being soft in texture."—*Mr. Lawrence's Twenty-seventh Lecture.*

[1] "THE TRUE PRINCIPLE OF ACTION IN ALMOST "EVERY ANTIDOTE IS AFFINITY FOR THE BANE OR "POISON TO BE NEUTRALIZED OR DESTROYED."—*Sir Humphry Davy, Quarterly Review, April* 1833.

I speak of affinity, because it is *unerring* in its action; when *once* established, it cannot be improved by alteration. For example, if the liver were to change in its process of producing bile, could it be considered an improvement? Would not health be impaired? And if the stomach were to change in its process of secreting the gastric juices, could digestion go on, or life be supported? And if the oxygenation of the blood failed in its regenerating office of converting the venous to arterial blood, could life exist?

It is by the power or test of affinity that I can discover the existence or nonexistence of disease, as well as the boundary of its extent; a *test* to which disease yields its power, and to the call of which it unfailingly answers; a *test* that may rescue the rising generation from their hereditary ailments; a *test*, the virtue of which is to be discovered, not only in raising the patient from the bed of sickness, but in recalling man from the lowering state to which insanity reduces him, and restoring him to the dignity of a rational being; a *test* that gives confidence to the patient, because he feels convinced, by the experience of others, that the removal of the humours can alone effect his restoration to health[1]. His

---

[1] "When the immediate seat of inflammation is as-
"signed to the living solids, the humoral pathology
"is not thereby meant to be rejected. Every consi-

object is, therefore, to have the humours extracted as long as they will flow, for he must know when he feels pain, and when he has none; when he is restored from the brink of the grave to the vigour of health. He must also know when the humours cease to flow from his person, and when the same remedy which produced the discharge healed it again, and afterwards could produce no other effect than that of refreshing.

These facts go to prove that my remedies are founded on the principles of affinity, and consequently they *establish a standard in the healing art, by which all men will be enabled to concur in opinion.* It has been urged, that so long as I keep the materials of which my remedies are composed a secret from the public, my discovery cannot be acknowledged as a science, and that

---

"derable change in the properties and relative quan-
"tity of the fluids produces an alteration in the mo-
"tions, tension and sensibility of the moving vital
"solids; and every great derangement of vascular
"action has a proportionate influence upon the con-
"dition of the fluids. But to make such a practical
"application of these facts, as to be able in every par-
"ticular instance of the disease *rightly to separate the*
"*cause from the effects,* IS A DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE
"HIGHLY TO BE DESIRED, BUT NOT HASTILY TO BE
"ARROGATED."—*Pearson, On Surgery.*

This is the power I possess, and by the operations of which my patients are restored to health.—J. L.

the laws of affinity upon which my system is founded cannot be perfectly established. Let me ask, who has yet discovered the material or property that produces the attraction of the needle to the North Pole? Or who has defined the cause of affinity in the metallic substance which composes the needle itself? Yet this great and most useful discovery is acknowledged by the world on the evidence of *facts* only; and although I deem it prudent, for the present, to withhold the materials of which my remedies are composed, my claims to science are not the less confirmed upon that account, since evidence and experience in the one case are as important and conclusive as they are in the other. The chemist only proves the affinity of metallic bodies to each other by experiments, and yet the world is satisfied with the results which *he* produces, although he is unable to make the metallic substance which produces the attraction. I show by experiment the affinity of my remedies to disease, and the evidence of my patients fully substantiates the facts which I allege. These facts I am at all times prepared to prove by public experiment, when properly called upon, and before any number of gentlemen of liberal feeling and of unimpeachable character[1].

---

[1] The following challenge was published in the 'United Kingdom' Newspaper on the 29th of Fe-

Now it must be admitted that my patients were the incurable of an opposite mode of treatment; and to effect their restoration to health, I

---

bruary 1833, and my reply was printed the week after in the same Paper.

"That the editor of this journal (the Lancet), ac-
"companied by only one witness, will attend at any
"place that Mr. Long and his 'admirers' may appoint;
"or if that be objected to, he will attend alone; and
"if Mr. Long will in his presence produce those effects
"by means of his lotion which have been sworn to by
"his witnesses at the Inquest, and which have been
"attested by noblemen and gentlemen in the above
"certificate, the Editor will then acknowledge to the
"assembled company, and afterwards to the world,
"that Mr. LONG HAS BEEN BASELY CALUMNIATED,
"THAT HE IS THE MOST TALENTED, SECRET OPE-
"RATOR IN THE UNIVERSE ..... Here, then, the
"question stands fairly before the public, *the medical*
"*profession on the one side, and Mr. Long and his ad-*
"*mirers on the other.*

"THOMAS WAKLEY."

(If a successful experiment on my part could prove all that Mr. Wakley has stated in the above challenge, it is fully established in the testimony of my hundred witnesses which is contained in this work.)

This was my reply:

"SIR,—I have already offered, in my first letter
"which appeared in your Journal, to rest the merits
"of my discovery upon experiments to be publicly per-
"formed; but it is absolutely necessary, for the satis-

have never done more than extract the humours *externally*, or have thrown them out by the secretions, and by an almost imperceptible perspiration, which is effected by the aid of inhaling, or other means, as the delicacy or nature of the

---

" faction of mankind, that these experiments, useful
" and important as they are, should be made by men
" of high character and attainments, whose testimony
" would be above suspicion, and whose characters have
" justly entitled them to the confidence and respect of
" the world.

" Mr. Wakley, who has twice put himself forward
" to decide upon the merits of my system, does not
" possess one qualification which, in my opinion, en-
" titles him to such an office. He has already been
" an active participator in a cruel and wicked combi-
" nation directed against my character, and he now
" would aggravate the injury by tempting me to asso-
" ciate my name with his.

" I rejected Mr. Wakley's challenge two years ago,
" because I considered that he was unworthy my no-
" tice; and I am not aware that his subsequent con-
" duct has altered the relation in which he stood with
" men of honour.

" But let it not be supposed that I object to submit
" my system to proper investigation. My former pro-
" position I now repeat, and am deeply anxious that it
" should be adopted; but my judges must consist of
" unprejudiced persons of unimpeachable integrity and
" undoubted honesty.

" Let any number of gentlemen, of high character

case may have required; but the properties of the remedies act on the principle already described.

So *new* is this practice, that the faculty, who do not doubt the cures I perform, cannot believe in the properties of my remedies, and declare that

---

" and scientific acquirements (not medical men), be
" selected, half by myself, and the remainder by mem-
" bers of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons; I
" will then deliver my lotion into the hands of these
" gentlemen, who shall try its properties and affinities
" upon the persons of a number of gentlemen, my pa-
" tients, who will be present; and they shall also be
" at liberty to apply it to their own persons. It will
" then be found, that the remedy will not only point
" out wherever there is pain or active inflammation,
" but will precisely mark the boundary of its extent;
" —that a discharge may be produced where there is
" disease, which will exude through the pores of the
" skin without breaking it;—that where there is no
" disease it will produce no effect whatsoever, except
" that of refreshing;—that it may be put into the eyes
" or swallowed with impunity; and that it may be ap-
" plied all over the body of infants with a beneficial
" effect.

" Lastly, these gentlemen may conceal from me
" where they have pain or active inflammation, and
" thus try the power of the remedy to discover it.

" I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

" JOHN ST. JOHN LONG."

" *Harley-street, Feb.* 28, 1833."

"*it is physically impossible that any medicine, or* "*any combination of medicines, should act on the* "*body in the manner alleged*[1]" by all my patients.

This is an important statement, because the public are thereby informed that I have borrowed nothing from any declared science, and that my discovery is at once original and wholly unaided by any medical practice.

Mr. Lawrence justly observes in his Lectures, that "the study of anatomy and physiology does "not make us acquainted with disease. You may "know the structure and functions of an organ "perfectly well, and yet be ignorant of its dis-"ease."[2]

---

[1] See Dr. Ryan's Medical Journal.

[2] "The most candid, and patient, and experienced "physicians, who are surely the best and only com-"petent judges of such a question, have been obliged "to confess that great numbers of our medical facts "and observations are as little to be relied on as our "medical theories.

* * * * *

"I much fear the French proverb will soon be "translated and naturalized in this island; and that "in a few years a book of medical observations will "be of as little value or authority as an equal number "of medical advertisements and certificates selected "from the London newspapers."—*Pearson, On Surgery.*

Age after age, theory after theory, have succeeded each other, but no remedy has hitherto been discovered that possesses the power of co-operating with the efforts of Nature for the removal of the seed or germ of disease.

The enlightened and meritorious *Jenner* has in reality made no discovery of this nature for removing the virus that produced small-pox, but for counteracting it in the system *only*, leaving the work of its removal for another to accomplish.

The gift of discovery does not fall to the lot of all men; its blessings dawn on the world at different periods.

The circulation of the blood was discovered by no other than the great HARVEY, though the father of anatomy lived before his day. Medical men dissected *then* as well as they do *now*; yet they were unwilling to listen to the new theory, or even to comprehend the mechanical action of the valves of the heart, owing to the reluctance with which any new system, however beneficial, is admitted that may injure the interests of the old. However, I trust that in this enlightened age the day is not far distant when *I* may, with the blessing of God, by multiplied testimony, be able to convince, at least the candid and unprejudiced portion of mankind, of the benefit resulting from the free use of my remedies.

Pain being the first evidence of the existence

of disease[1], I shall refer to it here, and will afterwards refer to the more formidable forms of ailment. *Pain* is the first symptom or warning given of the concentrated action of the deleterious fluid, commonly called inflammation[2]. However extraordinary it may appear, and however common the symptom, which is frequently attended by fever[3], the faculty declare themselves wholly

---

[1] "A remote cause is an agent or a power extrinsic "to the subject acted upon, which being applied, an "alteration succeeds, which is termed the effect: "these two facts, the antecedent and the consequent, "it is of importance to know; but *no one has yet ex-* "*plained satisfactorily the nature of the connexion be-* "*tween them.* * * * * *

"To expose, however, the fallacies by which dif- "ferent systematic writers have been misguided, is no "part of my present business; but I shall endeavour "to avoid the censure of temerity, by declaring that "I am unable to assign in a satisfactory manner "the PROXIMATE CAUSE OF INFLAMMATION."—*Pearson, On Surgery.*

[2] "Inflammation must have some exciting cause, "and the same cause will produce an effect under one "circumstance, which it will not under another."—*John Hunter, Treatise on the Blood.*

"Susceptibility for inflammation may be said to have "two causes, the one original, the other acquired. ".....Inflammation often produces mortification or "death in the part inflamed."—*John Hunter.*

[3] "Of all the morbid affections to which the human

unacquainted with its nature. In confirmation of this, I select the evidence of Mr. Lawrence, who is considered the most learned lecturer of the present time; and he says,

"I have already had occasion to mention, in "considering what is called the theory of in-"flammation, that this is a point not clearly "made out: we really cannot say precisely in

---

"body is liable, inflammation is not only one of the "most distinct in its forms, and important in its con-"sequences, but it is also by far the most frequent in "its occurrence. Indeed there are no external in-"juries of which inflammation is not almost the imme-"diate effect; and but few, if any, local diseases of "which it is not in some degree or other to be re-"garded as a concomitant, cause, symptom, or con-"sequence.

* * * * *

"When we come to consider the marks by which "the different species of inflammation are distinguished "from one another: the redness of parts which have "been slightly inflamed not unfrequently disappears "after death, so that it is sometimes difficult to dis-"cover the precise spot which during life had been "the seat of inflammation.

* * * * *

"During inflammation of the skin it can generally "be made to disappear for a moment under the pres-"sure of the finger, but it returns immediately after "the pressure has been removed."—*Thompson, On Inflammation.*

" what *that* disturbance which constitutes inflam-
" mation consists."

As to its being a deleterious fluid that can be separated from the body, they do not believe in *this*, because they were never able to remove it in the form I describe, though it becomes visible in every form of ailment, and in every stage of life, from infancy to advanced age, as will be demonstrated in the following pages. Pain and its symptoms are thus described: it is " acute, " chronic, simple, complicated, healthy and un- " healthy; it causes heat, anguish, redness and " swelling." All these appearances are produced by the influence of the virus and deleterious fluid, which I prove by the fact, that when I extract the fluids, *pain* and its inflammatory appearances are removed, as well as every symptom of disease[1].

The blood or the healthful properties of the system will not erode *themselves*; and if they *did*, the same destructive effects must be equally felt *all over the body*. But the case is otherwise with disease, as is proved by the generally local

---

[1] " The kind as well as the degree of pain varies " much in different inflammatory affections. In some " instances it is continued, in others periodic; some- " times it is acute, at other times dull; sometimes it " is of a pickering kind, at others itchy, lancinating, " or throbbing."—*Thompson.*

action of ailment, which becomes *concentrated*, and is *thus* thrown out by the efforts of Nature: *here* the power of the deleterious fluid becomes greater, which is accounted for by its irritating in its passage from the internal parts to the surface. In this case I apply my remedy to the inflamed surface, and extract a quantity of fluid (the humour and deleterious fluid), which affords relief from pain, and every diseased appearance; the patient is thus restored to perfect health without the aid of medicine.

I object to *different* remedies for the cure of the same disease, because different properties in drugs must produce different effects. Then the question is, Which effect is best? For if the practitioner is unable to decide upon the proper medicine at once, without the fear of other practitioners not concurring with him in opinion, he can have no other basis or foundation to depend upon than that of conjecture[1]. This state of uncertainty in which medical art is involved, no doubt induced the eminent French physiologist Bichat to write[2]:—

---

[1] "Medicine ever was, and ever will be, a conjec-
"tural science.....The dogmas of schools are dan-
"gerous, because, sanctioned by such an authority,
"they are embraced unexamined, and perpetuated."
—*Dr. Burrows.*

[2] "Were the affectation of writing prescriptions in

"Into what errors have we not fallen in the "use and denomination of medicine? It is," he says, "an incoherent mass of incoherent opi- "nions; and probably of all physiological sci- "ence, *that* in which the inconsistencies of the "human mind are most glaring. It is an incon- "gruous combination of erroneous ideas, obser- "vations often *puerile*, means at the best falla- "cious, and *formulæ* as fantastically conceived "as they are preposterously combined. It is "said the practice of physic has something in it "repelling: I will say more; in those principles "which connect it with the Materia Medica, it "is absolutely revolting to a rational mind."

Sir Anthony Carlisle gives a similar opinion; for he defines medicine to be "an art founded in "conjecture, and improved by murder."—(See *Lancet*.)[1]

"a language unintelligible to the public laid aside, "they would be soon enabled to decide between real "and pretended merit. The mystery observed on con- "sultation is also a strong support to quackery and "imposture, and has the further bad effect of taking "away that degree of responsibility which is the only "safeguard against incompetency and hazardous ex- "periment on the part of those to whom they entrust "their life."—*Dr. Morrison, Medicine no Mystery.*

[1] "It is certainly to be allowed that it is mainly the "interest of the ignorant and empirical part of the "medical practitioners, which, as I have above re-

Sir Astley Cooper says: "Far be it from me "to ransack the graves of those who have been "destroyed by surgeons!"; and in Lecture 53. he declares that "*poisons are those substances which, "in small quantities, produce deleterious effects on "the human body.*"[1] A poisonous mixture, for instance, that may be intended to operate on the liver, to promote a due flow of bile, must *first* mix with the gastric juice, then be taken up by the lacteals and conveyed to the thoracic duct; from thence be conveyed to the aorta, and then

---

"marked, constitutes FIVE SIXTHS OF THE WHOLE, "to prevent men from informing themselves on those "subjects, lest their inefficiency should be exposed, "and contrasted with the science and abilities of others; "and they have, accordingly, always endeavoured to "keep up this state of ignorance, and to oppose a bar-"rier to the general attainment of the principles of "physiological and medical science, by speaking of it "as one involved in intricate and almost incompre-"hensible difficulties; as dealing in secrets only *ap-"proachable by the initiated*; as enveloped in mid-"night horrors, to be sought in charnel-houses, and "courted in the pestiferous atmosphere of disease, and "in the arms of Death himself."—*Dr. Morrison, Medicine no Mystery,* 1829.

[1] "Now in order that you may have a chance of re-"moving irritation produced by another action in this "way, it is necessary that the new irritation should be "more powerful than that which already exists."—*Mr. Lawrence's Lectures.*

to the heart; from whence it is propelled through the arteries to the extremities of the system; and after this round returns again by the veins: and all this must take place before the disease can be affected by it, and thus the medicine becomes not only changed in its properties, but a deleterious effect must be produced on the whole system before it can reach its destination[1].

Now the faculty know of NO medicine that possesses the property of *counteracting* the disease of one organ, and at the same time of acting innocuously on other parts which are not diseased. In this way the whole system becomes infected with poison; for all counter-irritating remedies must be more powerful in their poison-

---

[1] "Some of the animal poisons exert a sedative "power so strong over the nervous system, as to put "an end to life in an incredibly short period of time "after they are received into the system. They ap- "pear at once to paralyse the whole nervous action "throughout the frame. Prussic acid, for instance, "(which has lately received the new name of hydro- "cyanic acid,) destroys a human being in about four "minutes after a certain portion of it has been swal- "lowed. This acid is of animal production, although "it exists in some vegetables.

"Most of the vegetable poisons called narcotics, "produce the same effect after a longer period: opium, "henbane, belladonna, hemlock, nightshade, &c., are "of this class."—*Dr. Morrison, Medicine no Mystery.*

ous virulence than the *internal virus*: hence the portion of blood which was before pure is by this means made impure[1].

I conceive it to be as unscientific to give mercury to disperse a disease of the liver which is produced by a humour, as it would be to disperse again into the system the humour of a boil[2]; because Nature points out that the disease should be removed locally. But medical practitioners object to the example which Nature affords them, and administer counter-irritants, which detains the disease in the system, till, in thousands of cases, the system is literally overcome by the accumulation of corroding medicines, and the original virus[3]. Now I contend that it would be in principle as unscientific and injurious *thus*

---

[1] "When an irritating matter of any kind is applied "to the secreting surface, it increases that secretion, "and changes it from its natural state (whatever that "be) to some other."—*John Hunter.*

[2] "Persons who are salivated have, as far as I have "remarked, the functions of the *liver* and digestive "organs constantly disturbed by that process. I can-"not, therefore, but think that it is wrong to use mer-"cury in hepatic affections."—*Abernethy.*

[3] "Why inflammation of any kind should cease "after it has once begun, is very difficult to *explain,* "or even to form an idea of, since we have no mode "of counteracting the first cause or irritation."—*John Hunter, On Gun-shot Wounds.*

to counteract an internal disease, as it would be to obstruct by mechanical means the exit of pus from an external abscess. My remedies have influence only where disease exists: but in the case of a blister, placed wherever it may, it produces a vesicle; and a patient may well exclaim, "Sir, I have no pain or disease where you are "applying the blisters, and why am I to suffer "such general torture because I have pain only "in my side?" How ridiculous and unskilful would the practitioner appear in the opinion of the patient, were he to reply, "It is necessary to "do this to remove the pain in your side." This would be literally the effect which the internal agents that are now in common use would have, if applied *externally*; for it is evident that what would erode and decompose the substance of the body *externally*, must act in a similar manner *internally*; but owing to the mucous substance which the medicines have to pass over, the acute action of the mixture is not immediately felt; yet the effects prove more fatal than in external counter-irritation, because the practitioner is unable to come into immediate contact with the internal diseased surface for the purpose of removing the poisonous and destructive effects of the supposed remedy: hence salivation takes place, while the disease of the liver is being counteracted. The celebrated John Hunter states, that "new dis-"eases arise from mercury alone; the tonsils

" will swell where no disease has been before;
" the periosteum will thicken, and also the bones,
" and parts over these will become œdematous,
" and sore to the touch[1].....The sensible effects
" of mercury are generally an increase of some
" of the secretions, a swelling in the salivary
" glands, and increase of saliva; an increase of
" the secretion of the bowels, which produces
" purging, and an increase of the secretion of
" the skin, producing sweat.....Mercury often
" produces headaches, and also costiveness.....
" The tongue, cheeks and gums swell, and the
" teeth become loose; all of which effects are in
" proportion to the quantity of mercury given.
" .....It produces great weakness in the parts,
" in which ulceration easily takes place."[2]

---

[1] "The continued action of calomel upon the mu-
" cous membrane of the stomach and bowels frequently
" produces great irritation and ulceration."—*North, On Convulsions.*

" I have seen fits both cured and brought on by
" calomel; and when this drug has acted thus dele-
" teriously, it has appeared to me to have done so,
" not so much from its weakening tendency, as by
" calling the diseased sensibility of the stomach and
" bowels too much into action."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

[2] "Westminster Medical Society, February 19,
" 1830. *Mr. Chinnock in the Chair.*—The President,
" on taking his seat, related the details of a singular

Before I close these introductory remarks, I beg to submit a document, to which is attached an honourable list of the names of individuals who fully support the foregoing statements; the original of which lies before me. Their separate evidence takes up too much space for this paper, but will, however, come in in an Appendix.

"WE THE UNDERSIGNED, HAVING BEEN PA-
"TIENTS OF MR. ST. JOHN LONG, AND HAVING
"HAD HIS LOTION APPLIED TO US, DO DECLARE,
"THAT NO BLISTERS WERE EVER RAISED UPON US
"BY IT, AND THAT WE NEVER KNEW OF ITS PRO-
"DUCING THEM UPON ANY OF HIS PATIENTS;
"THAT THE IRRITATION CREATED BY HIS LOTION
"HEALS AGAIN UNDER ITS DAILY APPLICATION;
"THAT WE HAVE USED THE SAME TO OUR FACES,
"HANDS AND CHESTS; AND THAT IT WILL PRO-
"DUCE A DISCHARGE FROM WHERE DISEASE EX-
"ISTS, BUT IN NO OTHER PART. MANY OF US
"HAVE ALSO HAD IT IN THE MOUTH AND SWAL-
"LOWED IT WITH IMPUNITY.

"case, communicated to him by Dr. Blundell. An
"ounce of crude mercury had been administered to a
"patient who had previously applied a blister to the
"chest. A few hours subsequent to its exhibition,
"'*scores of globules of quicksilver*' were observed on
"the blistered surface; thus proving the exudation of
"that medicine in its mineral form to the surface of
"the body."

"WE HAVE FURTHER TO ADD, THAT WE NEVER
" KNEW AN INSTANCE OF MORTIFICATION TAKING
" PLACE UNDER ITS USE, AND BELIEVE IT TO BE
" ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE THAT SUCH AN EFFECT
" COULD BE PRODUCED BY MR. LONG'S LOTION.

" M. A. Ashworth (Lady Ashworth). *Hall-place, St. John's Wood.*
" Caroline Rooke. *Hall-place, St. John's Wood.*
" Ingestrie (Viscount, M.P.).
" John Spottiswoode. *George-street, Westminster; of Spottiswoode, Louder, N.B.*
" G. L. Ormonde (The Marchioness of).
" H. Butler (Lady H.).
" H. Kavanagh (Lady H.).
" M. G. Prendergast (M.P.). *George-street, Hanover-square.*
" Harris (Major-General Viscount).
" Ormonde (The Marquess of).
" Jas. Shortall (Major-General, R.A.). *Phœnix Park, Dublin.*
" Chas. Neville (Lieut.-General, R.A.). *Sutton Cottage, Hounslow.*
" Fred. Campbell (Lieut.-Colonel, R.A.).
" George Spottiswoode (Lieut.-Colonel). *Gladswood, Melrose, Scotland.*
" M. Shawe (Lieut.-Colonel). *Dublin Castle.*
" A. Watson (Colonel, R.A.).
" W. Haughton (Commander, R.N.).
" R. F. Gambier, R.N. *Portland-place.*
" T. Montgomery. *Birch Hill, Antrim, Ireland.*
" E. C. Lloyd Hall. *Figtree-court, Temple.*
" P. H. Browne. *Castle Brown, Co. Kildare.*

" Sebright, Mawbey (Major-General). *Baker-street, Portman-square.*
" Sligo (The Marquess of).
" R. Burke. *Kildare-street, Dublin.*
" Samuel Oughton. *New High-street, Manchester.*
" Jane Campbell. *Woolwich.*
" Jane A. G. Fortye. *Guernsey.*
" A. M. M. Grindley. *North Bank, Regent's Park.*
" John Adolphus. *Temple.*
" William Abington. *East India House.*
" S. Southeby. *Charlotte-street, Bloomsbury.*
" R. Prendergast. *George-street, Hanover-square.*
" J. W. Coke. *Longford, Derby.*
" E. Tulk Hart. *Duke-street, Westminster.*
" Samuel O'Sullivan (The Rev.). *Phœnix Park, Dublin.*
" Richard Stewart (Rector of *Kildress, Co. Tyrone*).
" Samuel Blacker (The Rev. Dr.). *Mullybrack, Market Hill, Ireland.*
" T. Thompson. *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*
" R. G. Blewitt. *Monmouth.*
" Harriet Page. *Meeting-street, Ramsgate.*
" M. Christian (now Mrs. Thompson). *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*
" William Hodges. *Temple.*
" W. Conway. *North-street, Cavendish-square.*
" Thomas Fussell. *Mills, Frome, Somerset.*
" John Thomas Bridges. *Walmer, Deal, Kent.*
" J. Bourne (Captain, R.N.).
" John Braithwaite. *Bath-place, New Road.*
" S. Vercillina. *North Bank, Regent's Park.*
" Jane Macdougall. *Guernsey.*
" S. Dutton. *Hastings.*

" Ellen Gregory. *Shackelwell.*
" George Manley. *Holywell-street, Strand.*
" M. Colville. *Bryanstone-square.*
" William Barrows. *Cheltenham.*
" Helen Macdonald. *Bensham Lodge, Croydon.*
" Margaret Chaigneau. *Lower Fitzwilliam-street Dublin.*
" Jane Turnley. *Rock Port, Holly Wood, Belfast.*
" Henry Barry. *Cheltenham.*
" Henry Ravenhill. *Clapham Common.*
" William Ravenhill. *Clapham Common.*
" R. Alexander. *Standard Office, Liverpool.*
" James Harwick Oughton. *Elm Grove, Roehampton.*
" A. M. Lownds. *Hans-place, Sloane-street.*
" Catherine Oughton. *Elm Grove, Roehampton.*
" George Evans Bruce. *Wilton-crescent, Belgrave-square.*
" Holland Coham. *Dunsland, Okehampton, Devon.*
" E. Hill. *Donnybrook, Doneraile, Ireland.*
" Emma Shew. *Weymouth-street, London.*
" M. Chaigneau. *Lower Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin.*
" Sarah Webb (late Enticnap). *Chiddingfold, Godalming, Surrey.*
" James G. Waddall. *Devonshire-street, London.*
" E. Gibbs, Colonel (Aide-de-Camp to the King). *Albany.*
" John Pemberton (Mayor). *Hertford.*
" Charles L. Francis. *Vauxhall.*
" John Hambrough. *Steep Hill Castle, Isle of Wight.*
" Peter O'Brien. *Bank-place, Limerick.*
" Henry Musters (Grenadier Guards).

" C. A. Lewis (Captain, Queen's Bays).
" A. Grimes. *Yafford House, Isle of Wight.*
" G. W. Wilgress. 57, *Harley-street.*
" A. Fleming. *Greenville, Waterford.*
" J. Whale (Lady). *Harley-street.*
" H. Macdonald. *Bensham Lodge, Croydon, Surrey.*
" Frederick Sargent. *Treasury, Whitehall.*
" Amelia Thompson. *Blandford-place.*
" George Atkinson. *Queen's College, Oxford.*
" W. A. B. Abbington. *Marlborough Cottage, Park Village, Regent's Park.*"

The following individuals have not seen the above document, but have given their testimony to facts in confirmation of its statement.

R. Porter, Esq. (late Surgeon-General of Jamaica). *Bloomsbury-place, Brighton.*
General Sharpe, M.P. *Haddam Castle, Dumfries.*
Mrs. Sharpe. *Ditto.*
Colonel Lloyd.
Miss Bury. *Cheltenham.*
J. Caufield Irvine, Esq. *Bellevue House, Youghall.*
Miss Smyth. *Ballinatray, Youghall, Ireland.*
M. J. O'Connor. *Bentinck-street, Manchester-square.*
Henry Pelham Henage, Esq. *Grafton-street.*
F. H. Ramage, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians. *Ely-place.*
F. Macarthney, M.D. *Enniscorthy, Ireland.*
Mr. Taylor. *Enfield, Middlesex.*
R. Grindley, Esq. *North Bank, Regent's Park.*
The Countess of Buckinghamshire.
Mr. C. J. Christian. *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*

It may be said, How can it be true, consistently with this great body of evidence given in proof of the innocency and efficacy of my remedy, that both a wound and mortification were produced by its use on Miss Cashin's back and on Mrs. Lloyd's chest?

The evidence of my medical prosecutors in those cases, which I here briefly submit, will clearly show that there was neither a wound nor mortification produced by it in either case: consequently the whole charge is utterly unsupported by anything like truth. See Appendices I. and II.

Dr. Thompson states as follows, *upon oath:*

"After having carefully examined the body "[of Miss Cashin], and analysed the wound "[correctly speaking, the irritation], there was "neither SLOUGHING NOR MORTIFICATION; there "was no part of the back, as far as I could ascer-"tain, which had become dead previous to the "death of the deceased."

Dr. Ramage, in his exposure of the conspiracy, declares the sore on Miss Cashin's back to be—

"Merely an abrasion of the cuticle or scarf skin."

Mr. Wakley published a statement of the case, in which he declares, that

"There was not a single circumstance to jus-

" tify any man in asserting that the state of the
" part even indicated the approach of mortifi-
" cation; . . . . . in a word, with the exception
" of the dark film or pellicle which appeared to
" have been produced upon the surface of the
" cutis, the cuticle having been entirely abraded,
" the skin was not only not mortified, but un-
" usually vascular."—*Lancet*, Nov. 13th, 1830.

Mrs. Lloyd's Case.

Mrs. Campbell deposed, on oath, as follows:

" I saw it [the chest], and it was in a very
" vivid state of inflammation. I think the skin
" was not broken at the time: . . . . . the wound
" in the centre, which was as large as the top of
" a tea-cup."

Mr. Campbell, the surgeon who brought on the mortification, stated, on oath, that

" *There was no mortification on the wound when*
" *I* [Mr. Campbell] *was first called in to attend*
" *her on the* 12*th of October, nor for eight days*
" *after.*"

Captain Lloyd also stated, on oath, that

" There was a vivid redness across the breast,
" where the rubbing had taken place: . . . . . .
" the skin upon that dark spot, were much ex-
" panded: it did not break, but only discharged."

This gentleman confessed that " he had no wish

" to follow up the prosecution, but was compelled
" to do it by the medical profession."

So much for the conspiracy.

This document shows that I have only stated the result of a well-tried experience; for who can be better judges than those upon whose persons my remedies operated in their restoration to health? And *they* have also stated in separate documents, not only the results of my remedies upon their own persons, but also upon those of their *families and friends*[1]. It will be observed, that I do not seek to screen myself behind my general success in the removal of disease, because the great object which I have in view would not then be accomplished; for unless I can prove that my practice does not admit of a difference of opinion in its application, and that the nature of the disease cannot by any possibility be mistaken, my discovery is unworthy the name of a *System* or *Science*[2]. I therefore invite every interested person to peruse the body of evidence contained in the Appendix: *there* they will find the testimony of numerous patients who were

---

[1] See Appendix.

[2] In reference to the charges that were brought against me in two cases, a brief exposure of that conspiracy will be found in Appendices I. and II., and by which my innocence is fully proved.

restored to health, and who were *previously considered beyond the period of cure, by the most eminent of the faculty.* After these facts are ascertained, I beg an investigation into the simplicity of the system, to show that no danger can by possibility occur from its use in any case. I take this opportunity of stating, that I have not failed to restore any patient to health who was not previously considered as incurable by other practitioners, and hopeless by myself. Some few were persuaded to leave my practice before their cure was complete: to such I am not accountable.

Small-Pox[1] (of which convulsions are frequently the forerunner[2],) may be considered as

---

[1] "The earliest mention of this complaint, upon "which reliance can be placed, is an ancient Arabic "MS. preserved in the public library at Leyden, in "which Dr. John James Reiske says he read the fol-"lowing words: 'This year, in fine, the Small-pox "'and Measles made their first appearance in Arabia;' "the year alluded to being that of the birth of Maho-"met, or the year 572 of the Christian æra. . . . . "Had it, like the sentence of death pronounced upon "Adam and his posterity at the time of the Fall, formed "part of the original penalty imposed upon men for "the transgressions of their first parents, we might "reasonably conclude that no age or country would "have been free from its visitations."—*Hamilton's History of Medicine.*

[2] *Convulsions.*—"It is undoubtedly true, that con-

the principal or first form of disease that the deleterious fluid and virus *now* assume in early age,

---

" vulsions do frequently depend either upon a per-
" manently disturbed state of the cerebral functions,
" or upon some organic lesion of the brain. . . . . .
" Convulsions can only be regarded as a symptom of
" some other disease. . . . . It is doubtless true, that
" the death of a child is occasionally attributed to
" the accidental occurrence of a convulsive paroxysm,
" when it was destroyed by some other disease, of
" which that was comparatively an unimportant sym-
" ptom ; . . . . . that in a great majority of cases in
" which they occur, convulsions can only be regarded
" a symptom of some other disease.

* * * * *

" Of the PROXIMATE CAUSE or nature of convul-
" sions, we are, and probably shall ever remain, in
" doubt. We are equally unable to detect the essen-
" tial nature of most other diseases. We cannot ex-
" pect positively to determine the proximate cause of
" convulsions until we become acquainted with the me-
" dium by which the muscles are connected with the
" common sensorium and volition of the mind, and with
" the nature of the nervous power.

* * * * *

" During convulsions, the voluntary muscles are ex-
" cited without the concurrence of the will ; or if an
" effort of volition is excited, the muscles do not obey
" its dictates, as would be the case in a state of health.
" Without, then, possessing a knowledge of the essen-
" tial nature of convulsions, it must be evident, that
" wherever convulsive motions take place, *some morbid*
" *change must exist in the seat of volition, or in the*

while endeavouring to separate themselves from the infant frame [1]. Though they become inherent

---

" *nerves, or in both; or that the muscles may have* " *undergone some morbid alteration,* in consequence " of which they exhibit the various phænomena of " convulsions without any alteration in the nervous " system. . . . . Convulsions of infants are com- " monly divided by writers into idiopathic and sym- " ptomatic. The propriety of this distinction is doubt- " ful. . . . . Some primary affection of the brain, " which disturbs the functions of digestion: hence the " unsuccessful efforts which are made to cure the va- " rious kinds of headaches, which are as perplexing to " the practitioner as they are tormenting to the patient. " We not seldom attack the effect, and allow the cause " to pass unnoticed and unopposed."—*North, On Convulsions.*

" In every case of convulsion, the brain is at the " time organically affected, either directly or indi- " rectly."—*Dr. Clarke.*

" Galen adopted the opinion of Hippocrates, but " added another cause of convulsion,—an irritation, " stimulating the nerves, in consequence of the exist- " ence of SOME ACRID HUMOUR."

[1] *Small-pox.*—" The theory of the eruption being " the successful effort of Nature to throw the disease " to the surface, led to the horrid practice of keeping " the wretched patients in hot chambers, and subject- " ing them to a stimulating regimen, with a view of " furthering that desirable event; the consequences of " which plan were deplorable. Death ensued in one " half of the cases, and in many others blindness, from

by time, yet they cannot amalgamate or cooperate with the healthful substance of the body; because they are, in their properties and action, so wholly opposite to the healthful properties which unite in the support of life, that they cannot combine with them, and are therefore always at variance, and ready to leave the system when assisted. Nature is, however, always ready to lend her assistance to free herself from her disease: but she requires other aid to accomplish this great object; and this aid I am enabled to offer to all who seek in time to avail themselves of the virtues of a system of which I am the humble founder.

I shall here explain how this system operates in the removal of the corroding virus. Infants and children, with their attendants, are placed in an apartment, the atmosphere of which is charged with certain properties which they cannot avoid receiving into the lungs. The properties thus inhaled separate the unhealthy humours from the healthful: much of the former is carried off by the secretions, while the greater portion is thrown out on the skin, by insensible perspiration, in the form of a yellow matter or substance, similar to

---

"inflammation of the eyes; whilst, in those that "escaped, a foundation was laid for future inflamma- "tion and disease of the vital organs, the lungs, in- "testines, &c."—*Dr. Morrison.*

the small-pox pustule, and without breaking the skin, causing fever, or exhibiting a single pustule or the slightest eruption.

The linen worn by the children becomes frequently discoloured, and continues so till the disease is removed: when the sallow colouring of the skin disappears, they assume a more healthy complexion.

Some of the children who have been thus restored to health were placed with those who were suffering from small-pox eruptions, but they did not take the contagion, because there was no virus left in the system to establish an affinity between the *healthy* and the *unhealthy*; there was no humour to be excited to cause fermentation; and by this simple process the child is rendered, as it were, invulnerable to the contagious influence of disease in others. On this head I draw my conclusions from six years' experience.

Now it is obvious, that if this virus, which is exhibited in small-pox, be not removed, it must fall upon the organs, or remain in the system, when other more formidable diseases will make their appearance in afterlife[1].

---

[1] "One disease excites another, and therefore is "supposed to be the sole cause of it. Thus slight "fevers or colds, small-pox and measles, become "frequently the cause of scrofula; and certain de-

I have seen the lungs of children, on dissection, studded with tubercles of various growths, from the size of a small seed to that of the largest pea, while the whole system showed every mark of decomposition, produced by the destructive effects of the humour.

I am persuaded, if the virus and deleterious fluid which assumed a small-pox form were dissolved and removed by the means I have de-

---

" rangements of the natural actions of the body often " bring on the gout, agues, and other diseases."—*John Hunter.*

" The exception to, or qualification of, this principle " will occur to every one in the instance of what are " called specific disorders, or those affections which " invariably originate from a peculiar source, as the " small-pox, the measles, the hooping-cough, &c. But " even these exceptions I take to be more limited than " is generally supposed. In a paper which my late " esteemed friend Mr. Gifford did me the honour of " publishing some time since in the Quarterly Review, " I ventured to suggest that there is probably too much " division employed even in affections manifestly ac- " knowledging a specific origin. I there stated that, " in my judgement, Dr. Thomson was quite right in " contending for the essential identity of small-pox, " cow-pox and chicken-pox, the varieties being re- " ferrible to time, place and circumstance; and I also " stated my opinion, THAT EVEN SMALL-POX AND " MEASLES WERE ORIGINALLY ONE AND THE SAME " DISORDER."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

scribed, that the source of consumption, and the whole train of the hereditary forms of ailment, would be removed at the same time; and *here* rests the great advantage which my system offers to the rising generation.

I do not maintain that those persons who are by this means restored to health will be exempt from contracting other ailments, by intemperance, or the various privations to which they may be exposed.

A disease called *Water on the Brain* deserves attention here. To effect the removal of the disease, medical men have the head shaven; they apply blisters, issues, and other inflammatory agents, *external* as well as *internal,* and frequently without producing any good effect, because the agents applied do not possess the property of extracting the disease.

The kidneys may be excited to any extent, the blood impoverished, and the patient reduced to a skeleton, yet the disease remain unmoved. Now instead of making use of any medicine, or reducing the constitution of the child, I am enabled, by my remedy, to extract these inflammatory fluids through the integuments and skull, which continue to discharge till all the disease is removed, and the child restored to perfect health.

This shows the powerful affinity which my re-

medy has to the disease, enabled, as it is, to extract it through so solid a substance[1].

Now I maintain, that if the virus and deleterious fluid had been removed in the early stage, there could have been no irritation on the brain to exercise an attractive influence on the unremoved disease.

Consumption being the next general form of disease which derives its existence from the virus and deleterious fluid, and my remedies differing in their mode of application from those which I employ in small-pox, it will be necessary, in order that my system may be clearly understood, that I *first* remove an idea which is generally conceived, namely, that my system is that of *counter-irritation.*

All men, from the earliest ages up to the present time, agree in *this*,—that the remedy which is intended to act as a counter-irritant, must be stronger in its action than the internal disease. But to be more clear on the subject: Counter-irritation means the application of corrosive substances or liquids to any part where disease is

---

[1] "It may be supposed that bones are not capable "of being dissolved into pus; but we know that bone "has animal substance in it, and we also know that "this animal substance is capable of being dissolved "into chyle."—*John Hunter.*

supposed to exist, which irritate, burn and destroy the skin, and sometimes the muscles underneath. Thus a new disease is created, more powerful and inflammatory in its action than the one which is *internal*, and therefore may be said to counteract the former[1]. I admit that this gives temporary *relief*; but it is liable to objection, because a *new* disease is thereby induced, and the patient has then to contend against *two* maladies instead of one[2]. A blister, for instance, will generally take effect on any part of the body, and on every constitution, whether *healthy* or *unhealthy*: so will tartar-emetic ointment, &c.

---

[1] "For if blood-letting and counter-irritation be employed in order to diminish vascular action, or if mercury be used to some extent in order to induce the absorption of deposited substance, these measures must *aggravate* that disorder of the general health." —*Abernethy*.

[2] "By almost every authority, counter-irritation, excited in various ways, has been strongly recommended. Were I to judge from the results of my own observation, I should infer that counter-irritants have been extolled from speculative notions of the benefits they ought to produce, rather than from any practical proofs of their actual effect. In many cases I have seen both epileptic adults and children tormented for weeks and months by setons, blisters, tartar-emetic ointment, issues, &c. &c.; but in no one instance has either of these applications appeared to have any influence, either in abating the severity of

But *my* remedy will take no effect except where there *is* disease: and I submit that hereby the point is established that it does not produce any *new* disease; and as the blood contains the principle of life, a poisonous mixture must injure the vital fluid [1]. I have before stated that the remedy will extract a virus and deleterious fluid *only*, without breaking the true skin; because, when the attraction is produced, the humours exude through the pores; and when they *cease* to flow, all disease and pain is removed, and the same remedy which *caused* the discharge may be daily applied afterwards, without taking the slightest effect, except that of refreshing. I conceive that

---

"the subsequent paroxysms, or diminishing their frequency. It is an ungrateful duty to lessen the number of our presumed remedies, when we have so few to depend upon. A confession of ignorance, however, is much better than an assumption of knowledge we do not possess."—*North, On Convulsions.*

[1] "The blood can receive and retain extraneous matter, capable of destroying the solids, by stimulating to action so as to destroy them. . . . . If nerves, either of themselves or from their connexion with the brain, gave vitality to our solids, how should a solid continue life after a nerve is destroyed? or, still more, when paralytic? For the part continues to be nourished, although not to the full health of voluntary action: and this nourishment is the blood; for deprive it of the blood, and it mortifies."—*John Hunter, On Gun-shot Wounds.*

counter-irritation is a practice which at best only *attempts* to produce the effect which my remedies have *accomplished.*

Let me ask what the object can be of applying issues, if it is not to make a discharge? And what is the object of creating a discharge, if it is not to give relief, by drawing away a humour? Or what object can be attained by drawing away a humour, if it is not considered an unhealthy property of the body?

The following extract shows the uncertainty with which the faculty both *confirm*, and at the same time appear to *doubt*, *the existence* of the humour.

"The idea which has been entertained of me-
"tastatis is, that the diseased matter which was
"seated in one organ has been conveyed to an-
"other part of the body. It is a notion founded
"on the old ideas of humoral pathology. Now
"without entertaining any such mechanical idea
"of it, I may mention to you, that it frequently
"happens in gouty inflammation, that the in-
"flammation quickly disappears from *one* part,
"and another becomes as quickly affected. In-
"deed, *that* is all we can say about it; for *how*
"it happens *we are totally unable to explain.* A
"person who has swellings of various joints will
"have those swellings suddenly removed, and
"perhaps immediately afterwards inflammation
"comes on in the lungs or heart; and it is *this*

" liability to metastasis that constitutes a parti-
" cular danger in such cases."—*Mr. Lawrence's Fifth Lecture.*

Fever being a general precursory symptom, produced by the effervescent action of the humours, I here submit a few extracts, showing with what uncertainty the faculty view this important symptom.

" Puerperal fever has been known from the
" earliest times, certainly from those of Hippo-
" crates; but it was not described under that
" name until the year 1718, when Dr. Stokes
" gave it that title, in an essay published upon
" the subject. Hippocrates considered the ma-
" lady to be dependent upon a suppression of
" the lochia, an opinion which prevailed for se-
" veral centuries undisputed. In later times it
" has successively been attributed to a vitiated
" state of the humours, to a loaded condition of
" the alimentary canal, or inflammation of the
" intestines, aggravated by a fæcal accumulation.
" A few have written to prove it an inflammation
" of the uterus; others, of the ovaria; many, of
" the peritoneum: some, to establish the doc-
" trine of its being a general affection of the ab-
" dominal viscera; others, to show that it is com-
" mon fever, accompanied by peritoneal inflam-
" mation; and not a few have declined giving a
" specific opinion as to the seat of the disease.
" So much for the theory of the complaint."—

John Alexander, M.D., Practical Strictures on Puerperal Fever. Lancet, December 5, 1830.

"The chemical pathologists," says a writer in the *Encyclopædia Londinensis*, "were of opinion "that organic disease of any of the viscera was "engendered by a *morbid humour*: hence it may "very naturally be inferred, that in *this* case the "solid, or fibrous structure of the solids, and "coagulated portion of the blood, was the pri-"mary cause of disease."

Stahl was of opinion that disease arose from "a plethoric state of the system."

Frederick Hoffman believed that fever and inflammation arose from "spasm or constriction "of the capillary vessels, especially those of the "skin."

Dr. Cullen founded a portion of his theory of fever from an idea of "a morbid increase of the "circulation of the blood, *thus* producing a dis-"eased state of the humours of the body."

Dr. Darwin supposed it to arise partly from "inflammation of the stomach."

Dr. Harrison considers fever to arise from a "derangement of certain functions of the body, "dependent on the primary irritation of some "particular part."

Dr. Macculloch (having no doubt reflected on the volumes of contradictory opinions that are promulgated,) justly observes, that

"It is quite time that physic should cease to

" *assert*, and commence to *prove*; that it should
" reexamine what it has hitherto believed, to-
" gether with the grounds of belief; and not
" be contented, in these days of a better philo-
" sophy, with its ancient dogmas, or with *that*
" which it acts on from *habit*, *not* from convic-
" tion."

Mr. Lawrence observes, " You will not be sur-
" prised to learn, when the diseases of the whole
" body are enumerated, that they come to be
" reckoned up by hundreds or thousands." And in another part he states, that " the mere rela-
" tive position of one part of the body cannot
" alter the nature and treatment of the disease.
" . . . . . Inflammation, for instance, is the same
" kind of disturbance, whether in an *internal* or
" an *external* part."

Upon the above extracts I shall make no comment, but will leave my readers to draw their own conclusions.

Consumption affords me an opportunity of showing the fearful and increased ravages of the virus and deleterious fluid in another form *after that* of small-pox[1]. A person in the prime of

---

[1] " Of all the diseases to which the inhabitants of
" the British Isles are frequently subjected, pulmonary
" consumption, or phthisis pulmonalis, as it is styled
" by the best medical writers, may justly be reckoned

life would naturally be supposed to be better able to contend with the inroads of the disease, than he could do in the infant age, while suffering from small-pox eruptions: but the case is widely different; for in *this* form of disease the humours are considerably increased, and consequently they have greater power to do injury[1]. The blood be-

---

" one of the most fatal. The deaths which it occasions " happening chiefly to those who have arrived at the " most engaging period of life, are the more deplorable. " It is not, therefore, wonderful that this disease should " have claimed particular attention from the most emi- " nent medical writers. But notwithstanding the study " and labour of ingenious and discerning men for many " ages, phthisis pulmonalis still continues to be an *op-* " *probrium to the healing art*; and the prospect of " wiping off this *opprobrium*, by communicating to the " public a successful method of cure, is not great. " There is no reason, however, to *despair* of making " some progress in this important object; and IF me- " dical practitioners were enabled to distinguish the " different modifications under which this disease ap- " pears, at early periods, much good might be done." —*A. Duncan, M.D., On Consumption.*

[1] " I hope ere long to be enabled, through the " pages of the *Lancet*, to throw *some glimpse of light** " upon the proximate cause of phthisis pulmonalis."— *Dr. W. Reid Clanny.* See *Lancet, April* 13, 1833.

---

* The profession stand in need of some light, or they would never in such a state of ignorance dare to administer poison to counteract any form of disease.

comes more inflamed, from the power the virus and deleterious fluid has in absorbing the nutritious properties of the body, and of producing perspirations. The pulse quickens in its beat, in consequence of the blood being deprived of its nutriment; the digestive process becomes overpowered, and consequently the system can no longer receive the due proportion of nourishment. A thick yellow matter frequently appears on the skin, attended with alternate feelings of preternatural heat and cold: the lungs at the same time show every symptom of decomposition, by the exhibition of tuberculated matter, which strongly marks the power the virus and deleterious fluid have over the system in this advanced stage; and by *this* reaction of nature the patient consumes away[1]. Now, as I extract the

---

[1] "The final intention of this secretion of matter is, "I believe, not yet *understood,* although almost every "one thinks himself able to assign one; and various "are the uses attributed to it. It is by some supposed "to carry off humours from the constitution. It is "sometimes supposed a constitutional disease changed "into a local one, and so discharged or thrown out "of the body, either in form of, or with the pus, as "in those cases to be called critical abscesses; but "even those who see this final intention are very ready "to overturn it, by supposing that this matter is ca-"pable of being taken back again into the constitution "by absorption, and producing much worse evils than

virus or tuberculated matter from the lungs and system by the medium of the chest, sides and back, the disease becomes mitigated in its virulence, and the patient experiences immediate relief. I am assisted in *this* by the inhaling process, to which I submit all my patients. The properties of the latter remedy promote the secretions, restore digestion, cleanse the blood, and reinstate the organs in the power of again performing their functional duties.

Now in proportion as the humours are removed the patient recovers, and finally every symptom of health reappears. This proves most unquestionably that it is the virus and deleterious fluid, and *these* only, which produced the disease. I should here observe, that I frequently remove incipient consumption by inhaling only.

Why should persons doubt that consumption

" those it was meant to relieve. I believe that the " supposed cases of absorption are more numerous than " those where it is supposed to relieve ; if so, then by " their own account nothing is gained. Or it is pre- " sumed to carry off local complaints from other parts " of the body by way of derivation, or revulsion; for " this reason sores, as issues, are made in sound parts, " to allow other sores to be dried up; or even with a " view to oblige parts to dissolve themselves into pus, " as indurated swellings; but we have endeavoured to " show that the solids make no part of pus."—*John Hunter, On the Blood.*

can be cured by any new system? That *medicine* cannot remove this scourge from our nation is no proof that it cannot be removed: this ought rather to serve as a stimulus to the investigation of any new discovery that offers relief, particularly when supported by the evidence of those who were restored from the brink of the grave, and who are now enjoying the blessings of health[1].

---

[1] The following challenge was offered to me in 1828 by Dr. Reeve in the name of his fellow-physicians.

"If Mr. Long thinks he has discovered a successful "mode of treating pulmonary consumption, a disease "to which many thousands of our fellow-creatures fall "a sacrifice in the prime of life in this metropolis, how "easy would it be to put his treatment to the test of "experience! There is not a respectable physician in "this metropolis who would not supply him with cases "for this purpose; and if he should succeed in curing "one well-marked case, who would not most cheerfully "attest the cure? We would propose that six fair cases "be selected by a physician, from which Mr. Long "may make choice of one; and in case he should re-"store that one to health, let him have the merit of "the cure, AND A NATIONAL REWARD, TO WHICH "HE WOULD BE JUSTLY ENTITLED. By fair cases "we mean cases in the second stage, and not in the "last, or hopeless stage."

To which I made the following reply, in a letter to the Editor of the *John Bull*:—

"And this is the proposition of the faculty; this is "their regard for the lives of their patients! Or is it

If any one desires corroboration of this statement, I refer him to the evidence contained in the Appendix, where he will also find the names of the eminent practitioners who abandoned their separate cases as being beyond the reach of cure.

Whether consumptive patients were refused admission into the hospitals in the time of Lord Bacon, as they are *now*, I cannot say; but that great philosopher strongly condemns the absurd

---

" their unbounded confidence in the efficacy of my sy-
" stem? What! would every respectable doctor among
" them supply me with experimental cases! Would
" they place the lives of one or six individuals in a
" fair or curable stage of consumption, at the mercy
" of one whom they call an ignorant quack? This
" challenge is incredible. But since they have such
" an opinion of my skill, I will do more. If, not satis-
" fied with what I have already performed, and for
" which I have unquestionable vouchers, they will
" bring to me twelve or eighteen in three divisions of
" incipient, 'fair,' and desperate consumption, I will
" undertake the charge, and put my practice to their
" test: but after the unhandsome attempts already
" made, I must insist on their being persons of re-
" spectability, whose evidence would be irresistible
" with the country, and who are above being bribed
" or tampered with by my opponents.

" I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

" *Harley-street.* " John St. John Long."

—*John Bull, October* 12, 1828.

This challenge was never accepted.—J. L.

idea, that disease cannot be removed; for he says, "*By reckoning some diseases as curable*, and "others as *past* the period of cure, physicians "do only enact a law of neglect, and exempt "their own ignorance from discredit and in-"famy." Another author (Dr. Gowerson) says, "I am persuaded that we are still fighting in the "*dark* with disease and death."

The more I investigate the art of healing, the more I am convinced that the use of poisons serves only to retard instead of advancing the science; for who is there that has not either experienced or heard of the *secondary* symptoms of disease? I should rather say the secondary effects of the original virus, and of the poisons that were administered.

The celebrated M. Andral of Paris, during a lecture on the cholera morbus he lately delivered at the *Ecole de Médecine*, when speaking of the English practice of *gorging* patients with calomel, emphatically observed, "I must confess I cannot "account for the prostrate *veneration* which *En-*"*glish* physicians pay to this metallic poison. I "can only compare some of the English phy-"sicians in the East Indies to those poor Indians "who, faithful to their ancient creed, persist, "with words of mystic import, in plunging their "sick into the charmed water of the Ganges!" "In this country, no doubt, many hundreds of "invalids are annually hurried to their graves

" by excessive doses, or the continued use of " calomel, or of the blue pill, under the direction " of physicians or surgeons, who consider the " liver the source nearly of all the diseases to " which the English are subject."

Sir Astley Cooper states, in his 14th Lecture, that " mercury, if used to excess, often excites " sloughing, from the fever and consequent de- " bility of the constitution which it produces. " Whatever, in short, weakens the constitution " *much*, disposes it to the production of gan- " grene; for the body, when thus debilitated, " cannot bear any excess of action." In another part Sir Astley states, that " mercury, in " like manner, by rendering the body irritable, " disposes it to inflammation. . . . . Mercury, " given to excess, will tend to increase rather " than destroy constitutional irritation."

Many are acquainted with my success in the cure of the Bane, or Rot, in sheep. I have tried my experiments on upwards of seventy of these animals, in the presence of some of the most celebrated agriculturists and judges in this kingdom. And to prevent the possibility of a mistake occurring, they procured me *those* sheep which they had ascertained were *diseased*, and had the *best* of the lot killed on their arrival at my residence, to be fully satisfied on the subject. They also, by my desire, had collars placed on

the necks of the animals, to which they affixed their seals, that they might be enabled to identify them in their progress to cure.

I continued my experiments about five months, when illness prevented me from proceeding any further in them; but enough has been accomplished to induce those noblemen and gentlemen who witnessed my success, to determine on bringing the subject before the House of Commons in due time.

In these experiments I had ample opportunity of exhibiting the healthful influence which the inhaling process had on the organs, in cleansing the blood which had been deprived of its nutritious properties, and which had assumed a watery and inflamed appearance. By this means the offensive and spongy state of the flesh was gradually removed.

So powerful was the influence which the inhaling process had over the disease, that three or four days showed that a decided change had taken place towards health, and had partially deprived the hydatids of life. The quantity of hydatids which were invariably imbedded in the liver, gall-bladder, and the larger blood-vessels, died, dissolved, and were carried away in the secretions.

Medical men have done nothing yet for the removal of this destructive disease, nor do I believe it probable that they can ever eradicate it by

the aid of medicine. I have removed it, *not* by medicine, but by the simple process of inhaling.

Who, then, can wonder that incipient consumption can be removed by a similar process? The one is not more difficult than the other.

Now, I object to the remedies which medical men make use of in the attempt to cure consumption. They *bleed*[1]: *that* only decreases the power of vitality. They *blister*[2]: *that* does not remove the humour. They administer *poisons*: *these* only increase the virulence of the humour. They recommend change of climate: *that* only elevates

---

[1] Mr. Lawrence, in his Lectures, observes, "I do not "know that there is any one circumstance, or combi- "nation of symptoms, on which we can rely as a cri- "terion or index for pointing out when bleeding is "proper, or what quantity should be taken; certainly "the pulse will not afford *that* criterion."

"Bleeding is never allowable in consumption."—*Etmuller*.

"Dr. Walsh, Mr. Whyte and Mr. George Warren "have written strongly against the abstraction of blood "in the cure of disease."—*Alexander, Seventh Lecture. Lancet, Nov.* 28*th*, 1830.

"We also know that blood-letting often does imme- "diate good at the expense of after EVIL."—*Dr. Uwins On Indigestion.*

[2] "I should say, that if blisters were never applied to "children in any case whatever, much less evil would "arise from the want of them than is in common prac-

the sinking patient. They prescribe *weak aliment* and *low diet*; and *these* only hasten the case to a speedier dissolution. So that their remedies are only an accumulation of evils, which increase rather than mitigate the disorder.

Spinal Affections demonstrate the power of the virus and deleterious fluid in another form; for *here*, without any visible cause, the patient finds his back fail to support him. The inferior extremities being affected by this fearful humour, the patient generally resorts to inclined planes, and caustics are commonly applied on each side of the vertebra, with a view, no doubt, of drawing out a humour. When all this fails to restore the patient to health, after so profuse a discharge has been produced, and some years of suffering have elapsed, the physician may say to his inquiring patient, (who states his intention of trying my system, as a last hope,) that I (Mr. Long) can only produce a discharge, as *he* had done, therefore in what could the difference consist?

"tice daily, or perhaps hourly, inflicted by this popu-
"lar and painful practice. . . . . I have twice known
"infants destroyed in consequence of the sloughing of
"blisters, the progress of which could not be arrested.
". . . . . I believe, with much confidence, that the ad-
"vantage from blistering is rarely equivalent to the pain
"and general irritation it produces."—*North, On Convulsions.*

This is easily answered. The discharge which the issue created was NOT a discharge of the putrescent matter that produced the ailment; the issues made a discharge for themselves, from the *healthy* as well as the *unhealthy* properties of the body; and whether there was any ailment present, or *not*, they would produce the same effect: but *my* remedies take no effect, except where there *is* disease; therefore the latter remedy relieves the patient, after the former totally fails.

Had the virus and deleterious fluid been removed in the early stage as described, this disease would not have occurred.

GOUT is another hereditary form of disease, which changes its situation[1], and produces pain and swelling, wherever it accumulates; but when I extract the virus and deleterious fluid, as in other cases, the swelling and its inflammatory symptoms subside, and the pain ceases to exist. But what is still more important is, that the patient finds no return of his disease.

It is remarkable, in this form of ailment, that a copious exudation of matter frequently takes place, on the part affected only, by the aid of inhaling, and wholly independent of the *external* remedy.

---

[1] "The gout moving of its own accord from the sto-
" mach to the foot, or from one foot to the other, may be
" reckoned a translation of the gout."—*John Hunter.*

This is another proof both of the existence and locality of the virus and deleterious fluid, which if they had been removed, *gout* could not have occurred.

In fact, I know of no ailment that does not afford a similar proof.

The various swellings of the extremities are produced by the deleterious fluid and virus, which, in certain dispositions of constitution, excite fever, and then fall upon the limbs, frequently causing contractions of the joints, and forming deposits.

When the virus preponderates, white and other forms of swelling take place; and when the deleterious fluid preponderates, the appearance of erysipelas will occur.

Now the faculty seem at a loss to define the difference between inflammation and erysipelas, or to draw a correct line of demarcation between the one and the other.

Professor S. Cooper states as follows. "I be-
" lieve no rational doubt can be entertained about
" the propriety of classing erysipelas with inflam-
" mation, when it is recollected that, where red-
" ness, swellings, heat and pain exist, inflam-
" mation must always prevail. . . . . In consider-
" ing the causes of erysipelas, you will naturally
" inquire, why any local irritation should pro-
" duce in one person erysipelas, and in another
" only common inflammation? *This fact is diffi-*
" *cult to explain*. . . . . That it is the nature of

" the disease, frequently to be getting *well* on
" one side, as fast as it is spreading on the *other*.
" .....I should say, then, that erysipelas can
" only take place under circumstances which
" have some determinate, *but unknown*, unfavour-
" able influence on the system."—*Lecture* XVIII.
November 1832.

Sir Astley Cooper in his third lecture, speaking of the "proximate causes of inflammation," states: "With regard to these, there has been,
" and still is, much difference of opinion. Boer-
" haave's opinion, of an obstruction in the smaller
" vessels, arising from the thickness of the blood,
" is false; for, instead of being thicker, it is ab-
" solutely thinner. Cullen's theory, of spasm
" in the extreme vessels, is equally erroneous.
" These are the results of opinion not founded
" upon observation. We should observe *first*,
" and think *afterwards*. The true proximate
" causes of inflammation appear to be an in-
" crease of action in the vessels of the part, and
" an increase in the size of the vessels them-
" selves.....We find that inflammation, when it
" is extremely active, occasions a destruction of
" vital power." Though Sir Astley Cooper doubts the opinions of other medical writers, yet he has not given a clearer elucidation of this important subject himself, nor assigned any cause for the thickening or thinning of the vessels, or of their increased size.

In reference to Professor Cooper's statement, the influence of the deleterious fluid, or virus, must ever be unfavourable: whether in a dormant or active state, it must be accumulating. Its leaving one part of the body, and appearing in another, proves, beyond all doubt, the locality of the disease, and its natural tendency to separate itself from the system.

Sir Astley Cooper confirms this statement; for he says, that "by removing this inanimate sub-
" stance, the power of the absorbents will be in-
" creased, and a quicker separation of the *dis-*
" *eased* from the *healthy* parts be the conse-
" quence..... Ulcers are frequently formed for
" the purpose of allowing the discharge of ex-
" traneous bodies; when such substances become
" lodged, therefore, in any part of the human
" frame, inflammation is excited, pus becomes
" secreted, which, pressing towards the surface,
" ulceration takes place, and the extraneous
" substance is thus afforded an opportunity of
" escaping."

Now, in the various forms of swellings in the joints, I extract the virus, or deleterious fluid, and the joint is restored to its usual free action. I have also succeeded in restoring many contracted limbs to their former power.

I am confident that numerous amputations take place that might be avoided were medical men enabled to extract the humours; but expe-

rience proves that they are not able to do so, and the consequence is, that either contraction or amputation becomes the result in thousands of cases.

Dropsical Affections are generally produced by an inactive or diseased state of the kidneys, caused by the deleterious fluid, or virus.

Now when I extract these humours in the early stage, *externally*, and by other means, the organs again perform their functional duties, which renders unnecessary the more than disagreeable surgical operation of drawing away the fluid. Delicacy forbids further elucidation of this disease; but the importance of the benefits which I am enabled to afford in this, and the various forms of uterine affections, stone, cancer, &c., needs no comment from me.

Flow of Blood to the Head strongly marks the changeable state of the humours; yet medical men give no reasons for this form of disease, except the accumulation of blood. Now how can this happen, since there is no alternate action of the heart to cause it? And even if there were, the pressure could not last any length of time, for the blood which the heart propels through the arteries by the expansion and contraction of these vessels is again brought back by the veins, and thus the head must be relieved; in fact, if

such an action of the heart could at all take place, all the body must feel its influence, by the distension of the vessels; for who will contend that the blood was propelled with such power, that it remained in the vessels and could not return?[1] If this *were* so, the circulation would be impeded. No reason is, however, given for this supposed stoppage of the venous system. There are no valves in these vessels to prevent the return of the blood, and the expansion and contraction of the arteries are equal in their action in propelling it. How, then, can there be a flow of blood to the head? It is true that the system becomes overcharged or excited; but then the pressure is equal, and the slightest vessels give way by the influence of the corroding humours, as in apoplexy.

For this form of ailment bleeding is resorted to, with the idea that the pressure must be relieved by reducing the quantity of blood. So far

---

[1] "A French author has, indeed, maintained, that "pressure from blood has nothing to do with causing "the sentient abolition; a position which he endea-"voured to establish by injecting blood into the heads "of animals, without producing the symptoms of apo-"plexy. These oppositionists, however, to vulgarly "received principles, are apt to push their objections "too far; and I believe those are the nearest the "truth who take a midway stand on these DISPUTED "POINTS."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

the object is attained; for when the blood is lessened in quantity, the humour becomes less oppressive. *This*, however, does not effect a cure, since the virus which caused the malady still remains in the system, to operate at a future period.[1]

The truth is *this*: The humour, being a lighter body than the blood, floats in the circulation, and frequently lodges in the head. This is proved by the fact that instant relief is felt when I extract the humours by means of my remedy; and sufficient time has now elapsed to establish that the relief thus afforded has proved permanent in every case.

A man will become intoxicated by wine or spirits, and, in consequence, will lose the muscular power of the body, as well as the free exercise of his mind; but he is not bled for this, because experience has shown that as the spirit evaporates the intoxication subsides. All must admit that this action is produced by the spirit, which naturally ascends to the brain, and produces temporary derangement. In these in-

---

[1] "I would ask, too, practically, does blood-letting "cure disorders in which there is fulness of the vessels "of the head? It must be granted, that in many in-"stances it temporarily alleviates them, but in others "it fails to relieve, and even aggravates them."—*Abernethy*.

stances, a preternatural heat may be felt on the head, as in the case of insanity.

Epileptic Affections are also dependent on the virus, or deleterious fluid, and may in some degree be classed with what is called flow of blood to the head, in its periodical attacks; but this form of disease is more severe in its effects, because the accumulation of the humours becomes vastly greater in quantity, and they consequently produce more fearful and fatal effects. A convulsive, and frequently a paralysed, action of the whole system takes place; distortion of the features; a fixed and convulsive action of the eyes; a frothy exudation from the mouth; sickness of the stomach, attended with great thirst; and a temporary derangement of the mind.[1]

---

[1] "It is a matter of vague belief, that epilepsy is an "hereditary disease; but statistical facts in sufficient "number are yet wanting to elucidate this subject." —*M. Andral, D.M.P., &c., Lancet, April* 1833.

"It has been truly observed by Dr. G. Gregory, "that 'considerable difficulty has been found in con- "'triving a definition of epilepsy, which may include "'every form of the complaint; and not less, perhaps, "'in establishing the precise nosological distinction "'between it and the other varieties of convulsive dis- "'ease.' In the adult, the resemblance between hy- "steria, tetanus, epilepsy, and apoplexy, is often so "close, that the distinctions we admit in our nosolo-

Now, as I extract these humours, the disease subsides in its virulence, and when *all* the deleterious fluid, or virus, is removed from the head and other parts of the body, the patient is perfectly restored to health, and has no return of his malady.

What stronger evidence can be offered that the humours, and *they only*, produce the malady,

---

" gical arrangements must in some cases be confessed " to be rather arbitrary than derived from any essen- " tially different appearances between these different " maladies. * * * * *

" Epilepsy is sometimes an hereditary disease; but " it is much more frequently acquired after birth.

* * * * *

" HIPPOCRATES has left us two aphorisms respect- " ing the prognosis in epilepsy, which subsequent ex- " perience has proved to have many exceptions: ' 1st, " 'Those who are attacked before the age of puberty " 'recover; 2ndly, Those who are attacked after the " 'age of twenty-five remain epileptic during the re- " 'mainder of their lives.' HEREDITARY EPILEPSY " IS RARELY IF EVER A CURABLE DISEASE."—*North, On Convulsions.*

" ..... That it is now serous, according to the " phraseology of some pathologists, which, perhaps, " means that the exhalent vessels, having lost their " retaining power, or being pushed into action be- " yond their endurance, throw out large quantities of " serum, or lymph, from their open extremities; that " it is sometimes *inflammatory*, or, in other words, the " consequence of a degree of inflammation in the brain-

in this form of disease, and that it derives its existence from the virus, or deleterious fluid, which first makes its appearance in small-pox eruptions?

Paralysis exhibits the wonderful power which the deleterious fluid, or virus, frequently has over the functions of the brain, the nervous system and faculties[1]. But when I extract these inflamma-

---

"vessels; and that it is occasionally a mixture of the "whole.*..... It appears to me that, in the general "way, apoplexy and palsy are considered to be brain "fulness, or brain pressure, without enough of looking "BEFORE, AND AFTER, AND AROUND."†—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

[1] "When there is considerable and continued para-

---

* "A few days since I was present at a most minute *post-"mortem* examination, the individual having been the subject of "both apoplexy and palsy. In the whole of the brain there was "not the slightest appearance of anything marking disordered "state. The apoplexy here had been purely *nervous.*"

How is this proved? The phænomena of death clearly show that as the blood receded from the brain, so the deleterious fluids, which were the primary cause of the malady, also receded with it. Dr. Uwins confirms this by stating, "You may meet with a vast mea-"sure of brain irritation, which shall be an index of anything but "an inflamed brain."

† "One author has told us, that when apoplexy is accompanied "by decided palsy of one limb, or one side, that then we may be "sure that there is no blood or serum poured out upon the brain; "but that when there is an absence of partial palsy, the apoplexy "has been that merely of fulness of vessel: and there is some cor-"rectness in the position..... Some eminent pathologists have "given it as their opinion, that the blood is never absorbed which "has once been thrown out upon the brain; but in this they are "erroneous."—*Dr. Uwins, On Indigestion.*

tory fluids through the head and other parts, and the healing process is completed, the invalid is restored to the free exercise of his mind and body.

Brain Affections.—These assume a greater variety of symptoms than any other form of ailment of the body, because the brain is more or less subject to the visitation of every impure fluid, natural or artificial. Thus, an undue flow of humour will ascend to the head by the circulation of the blood: if this were not so, how could those who suffer from affections of the stomach complain of the immediate sympathy which these ailments have in affecting the head? All impure fluids which are forming into a virus or deleterious fluid, being of a lighter body than the blood, have a tendency to ascend by means of the circulation; this is shown by the thousands of young persons who complain of no other ailment than that of headache[2].

There are different stages of affections of the

"lysis, there must necessarily exist some pressure or "organic disease in the brain. ..... When there is "organic disease of the brain, the case is very hope-"less."—*Abernethy.*

[2] "We do not as yet know enough of the brain and "its connexions to say, with satisfaction, why *epilepsy*, "and not *apoplexy* or *palsy*, should result from a cer-"tain condition of the organ; but so far as we do "know, we should say that the influence of the MOR-

brain, caused by these corroding humours, where the mind is not affected.

Loss of Sight and Hearing.—Of the latter I have generally found that as I remove the humours from those patients who were deaf, they have had both their hearing and sight restored.

I have invented a machine, by which I am enabled to soften and extract the coagulated matter from the ear without passing any instrument or acid into it that might injure the hearing more than the original disease.—I should observe that malformation, or extensive injuries, are irremediable.

Dr. Fosbrooke says, "Nine out of ten of "what are called aurists, are but swindlers "under another name; impostors getting money "under false pretences."—Vide *his Paper on the Cure of Deafness. Lancet, January* 15, 1831.

Loss of Sight, whether by cataract, opacity of the cornea, amaurosis, loss of sensibility of the

---

"BIFIC CAUSE in the convulsive disorder, if the same "in kind, is not alike in degree: it attempts, as it "were, to effect the same destruction of the voluntary "power as is accomplished in *apoplexy* or *palsy*; but "failing of complete success, the muscles are thrown "into convulsions by an attempt on the part of volition "to counteract the DELETERIOUS INFLUENCE."—*Dr. Uwins.*

retina or optic nerve, or other forms of ophthalmic affections, depends for existence upon the virus, or deleterious fluid, which is proved by the fact, that as my patients recover from other diseases, by the removal of the humours, their sight frequently recovers also in the same proportion. Mr. Curtis in some degree concurs with me; for he says, "by attending to the local "and constitutional treatment while removing "the deafness, he frequently succeeded in re-"storing sight without the pain and uncertainty "of an operation."

Ringworm, Scald Head, and other forms of porrigo, depend for existence on the deleterious fluid, or virus, and are, from their situation, easily removed.

Tic Douloureux and Locked Jaw strongly mark the preponderating influence of the deleterious fluid, by its rapid and painful movement on the nerves. This form of disease yields to the attraction of my remedies.

Insanity.—This is truly the most dreadful and afflicting of any form of disease to which the human frame becomes subject; for the influence of the excited and preternaturally heated fluids (the deleterious fluid, or virus,) will derange the strongest mind, and reduce it from the rank of

rationality to a lower level than that of brute instinct[1].

The vital or immaterial principle never was, nor ever can be destroyed, because it is immortal, and not subject to decomposition like the flesh[2]. Yet it has not the power of repelling hereditary ailments, or any injury of the body, but is subject to the influences of disease.

Of the disorders of the mind, "the absolute "source, if ever fully developed," says Lord Bacon, "will be found to exist in corporeal "changes, or the effects of external agents act-"ing on the gross machine, and not primarily "on the immaterial principle, as has unfortu-

---

[1] "The proximate cause of mental derangement can "never be known till the nature and essence of mind "be unveiled to mortal view,—a knowledge equally "hidden with that of life itself."—*Dr. Burrows, On Insanity.*

This statement marks at once the very limited view which medical writers take of this important subject. It presumes to limit the decrees of Heaven, and it vainly attempts to extinguish all future investigation. This is indeed a curtain of mystery, which I have in some degree removed by facts and the most conclusive evidence.

[2] "Some, instead of studying the phænomena of cor-"poreal disease or morbid actions in the insane, have "suffered their attention to be led astray by psycholo-"gical disquisitions, German mystifications, and Bed-"lam sketches. Though well calculated to gratify a "romantic and prurient taste, such productions have

" nately for the subjects of disease been too com-
" monly apprehended."

The above extract is important, and I am proud to say that it fully supports my conviction of the primary cause of disease; and the evidences that I shall submit will establish that I have literally fulfilled the prophecy of the great Lord Bacon.

Many insane persons die without leaving any marks of disease on the brain: this is a cause of much difference of opinion among medical men. But those who thus argue for visible appearances after death, ought not to forget the wonderful change the phænomenon of death produces on the body: I may instance the great and unaccountable absorption of the blood. In such a

---

" tended, in a lamentable degree, to divert inquiry from
" the real character of insanity. It is holding up the
" shadow only, while the substance eludes observa-
" tion. * * * * * *

" In reference to the difficulties attending the study
" of this malady, Dr. Ferriar observes, that Nature, as
" if in ridicule of the attempts to unmask her, has re-
" conciled contradictions and realized improbabilities
" with a mysterious versatility, which inspires the true
" philosopher with diffidence, and reduces the syste-
" matic to despair. * * * *

" That the operations of the mind are wonderfully
" influenced by our corporeal movements cannot be
" doubted; and that the influence is reciprocal, so that
" when the former are disturbed the latter sympathize,
" is clear."—*Dr. Burrows, On Insanity.*

state, who in his senses could expect to find a deleterious fluid on the brain, if he even believes, not only in its existence, but of its being the cause of the hallucination of the mind? Dr. Burrows, without assigning the cause of the malady, supports my evidence; for he asks, "Where is "the anatomist who will dare maintain that a "brain is free from disease or structural change, "because, after the most minute investigation, "he cannot discover any?"

Who ever found upon dissection the exciting cause of tic douloureux, St. Vitus's dance, or many other painful affections?

Abernethy says, "Paralysis may take place "without any visible change of the structure in "the brain. I have met with numerous instances "of this kind, but could not determine whether "the affections were merely nervous, or whether "they were produced or aggravated by disorder "of the digestive organs. I only know that the "patient died affected by apoplexy, hemiplegia, "or more local paralysis, without any derange-"ment in the evident structure of the brain."

Crichton confesses that, if he were asked what was the state of a diseased brain which produced mental disorder, he should say, "that "the arterial action of the brain itself was altered "from its healthy state, and that as soon as the "altered action subsides, the healthy operations "of the mental faculties return."

As far as this opinion goes, it fully supports my own experience; for when I extract the deleterious fluid, or virus, the insane patient becomes sane. But Crichton has not informed us whether this desirable object is obtained by any other mode than that of the efforts of Nature, in changing the situation of the disease, before the structure was injured.

In January 1833 Sir Henry Halford informs us, in his Introductory Lecture for the season, that music, a circumscribed reading of the Scriptures, amusements in the garden, and tartrate of antimony, are the chief of any known agents for the removal of insanity; and the examples the worthy Baronet offered were King Saul and King George the Third.

Permit me to ask, will music extract the deleterious fluid, or virus, or remove the diseased structure of the brain? Will a limited reading of the Scriptures effect this great object? Will digging in a garden and swallowing tartrate of antimony remove the necessity of the strait-jacket or confinement? Will such exercise remove pain, or the preternatural heat that is generally and almost invariably felt on the head of the insane?[1]

---

[1] In the early stage of the disease, prior to the vitality of the brain being destroyed by the deleterious fluid.

I wish to know by what order of affinity can such agents act upon disease? and if the number of asylums is lessened by the free use of these antiquated remedies?

It may be urged that a person from unexpected news, good or bad, will become insane. I admit it: so will a person become ill, and be excited by fever, which is produced by the sudden action of the deleterious fluid, or virus, upon matter, which will cause a convulsive action of nature, and thus arouse the impure fluids, which will naturally be attracted to wherever the excitement is greatest by affinity.

It may be argued that insanity runs in a family. I grant it: and why not an hereditary tendency to a disease on the brain, as well as of any part of the body?

Asthmatic Affections in many cases prove the influence the humours have over the faculties. I have had patients who were insane in consequence of the humours leaving the chest and flying to the head; but as I extracted the humours, the patients assumed the free exercise of their reason, and lost the primary cause of the asthmatic affection at the same time, and consequently had no return of the disease.

I recollect reading in one of Sir Henry Halford's Lectures, of instances where the asthma left the chest and flew to the head, that the patient

became insane; and when it left the head and returned to the chest, he resumed the use of his faculties, but unfortunately retained the asthmatic affection. The result is, however, widely different in my practice.

I again affirm, that if the deleterious fluid, or virus, were removed in the early stage, thousands of victims to the malady would be saved from their unhappy fate. Who can deny that the virus, or deleterious fluid, has the same power in softening or dissolving the brain, after a certain period, as it has in forming abscesses in other parts of the body? But I should here observe, that I consider a dissolved or softened state of the brain incurable, in consequence of the structure being destroyed.

In confirmation of the foregoing arguments, I submit two documents, which may prove interesting.

"We, the undersigned, have been personal
" witnesses of the effects produced by Mr. Long's
" mode of treatment on one of his patients, whom
" we visited at her residence. She was much
" excited, and irritated at our being admitted to
" her apartment, and did not recognise her pa-
" rents, while her conversation gave ample proof
" of her being insane. Mr. Long applied his
" remedies to her head, which immediately pro-
" duced a flow of liquid matter from the temples.

"A short time only elapsed till she came to her "reason, recognising at once her friends, and "speaking rationally, assuming a different tone "of voice, and placid demeanour[1].

(Signed) "HAREWOOD.
"DARTMOUTH.
"HOWE.
"THOS. LAWRENCE. (Sir Thomas.)
"INGESTRE."

"We the undersigned, who are patients of "Mr. Long, give our testimony to an extraor-"dinary fact, which took place in our presence, "as it is one of the most astonishing and pow-"erful tests in justification of those who advo-"cate that gentleman's discovery, in healing the "system, and removing inflammation therefrom. "The fact relates to a patient of Mr. Long. We "saw, about a fortnight since, on three different "occasions, a quantity of matter extracted from "his temples, and produced by the same ex-"ternal remedies that we were applying to the "different parts of our bodies, for the purpose "of removing inflammation. We may observe "that the gentleman at the above time appeared "to labour under an extraordinary degree of "excitement; but since the above process he

[1] This person continues in good health, and has had no return of her malady.

" has gradually recovered the appearance of per-
" fect collectedness, and sanity of mind.

(Signed) " PETER O'BRIEN, *Limerick.*
" S. H. OUGHTON, *Manchester.*
" G. DENZI, *Palermo.*
" INGESTRE.
" W. ABINGTON, *East India House.*"

" London, 7th October, 1833.

" We the undersigned, being patients of Mr.
" Long, have witnessed, during our attendance
" at his residence, about two years ago, the pro-
" gressive restoration to health and sanity of
" mind of a gentleman who, while attending Mr.
" Long, was exceedingly excited, and with much
" difficulty could be controlled. A copious dis-
" charge of offensive matter was produced on the
" back of his neck and temples by the use of
" Mr. Long's lotion, which gradually effected
" the desired object of restoring him to his rea-
" son: the heat on his head was so great, that
" when the lotion was applied steam arose from
" his head and eyes. Since the above period, he
" has filled a responsible office in His Majesty's
" service.

" J. HOUGHTON (Commander, R.N.), *Park-place, Paddington.*
" WILLIAM HODGES, 12, *Paper Buildings, Temple.*

"J. T. Thompson, 6, *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*

"Colonel Gibbs (Aide-de-camp to the King), *Albany*, November 15, 1833."

"I am well acquainted with the gentleman "alluded to in the above case, and with the "truth of the circumstances stated. I have also "seen him about two months ago.

"J. Shortall (Major-General), *Phœnix Park, Dublin*, October 7, 1833."

With these documents I close my remarks, which have been made upon the basis of experience and facts only, where the erring and conflicting opinions of theorists have no footing[1]. Thus have I laid the foundation of my system of healing the ailments of the human race, in the removal of those primary causes of disease which are inherent in man's corporeal frame, and which, in the order and course of nature, will last as long as the present construction of his body;—a

---

[1] "All the theories, it has been wisely observed, "which have yet been offered by physiologists on this "subject, are entirely unsupported by proof, and, what "is worse, are of such a kind, that it is neither pos-"sible to confirm nor to refute them, by an appeal to "experiment or observation."—*Dr. Burrows, On Insanity.*

system which is able to remove the seeds of disease in the infant age, and release mankind from all their hereditary ailments.

In whatever way I investigate the subjects of disease, whether in a curable state or otherwise, I can only arrive at the same conclusions; for every form and character of disease yields to the same test of *affinity*, and consequently unites in establishing the fact, that a deleterious fluid, or virus, is the primary cause of all our hereditary ailments, and which is found to prevail in families, with peculiar power and character, from one generation to another; depriving the natural and moral faculties of their power of action, vitiating the passions, overwhelming the mind, and in thousands of cases sinking to an abyss of confusion and misery the wretched subjects of suffering and disease; rendering them lost to all the enjoyments of this life, and incapacitating them for the contemplation of the happiness of a better state. And can any one deny that the same Power which inflicted the penalty of disease can also in his mercy make known the means of its removal?[1]

---

[1] "Madness is one of the curses imposed by the "wrath of the ALMIGHTY on his people for their sins; "and deliverance from it is not the least of the mira-"cles performed by CHRIST."—*Dr. Burrows, On Insanity.*

EVIDENCES

UPON WHICH

THE AUTHOR RESTS HIS CLAIMS TO THE CONFIDENCE OF THE COUNTRY.

"I QUESTION MUCH WHETHER THE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF "PHYSICIANS, OR THE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS, "COULD PRODUCE SUCH A BODY OF EVIDENCE OF THEIR SUCCESS, AS "THE GENTLEMAN AT THE BAR (MR. ST. J. LONG) HAS DONE OF "HIS."—*Mr. Justice James Allen Park, in his Charge to the Jury.*

Gower Street, January 24, 1834.

MY DEAR SIR,

I CAN have no hesitation in complying with your request; for feeling, as I do, that I have derived most important benefits from your remedies, it is but an act of justice to state, for your satisfaction, and that of your friends, what the situation was in which you afforded me so much relief. For many years I had been subject to various maladies, in which I had been much assisted by the skill and care of my medical and surgical friends, particularly Sir Charles Scudamore, Sir Astley Cooper, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Copeland, and Mr. Stafford; but I was still a victim to an increasing and, apparently, in-

curable malady, that of shivering fits, resembling the most violent ague. These fits used to attack me without the least warning, and without my being able to assign a cause; when I was engaged in conversation, sitting down to dinner, or in the midst of any other occupation, unexposed to air and unexcited by passion. These shiverings agitated me all over in the most violent manner; they were accompanied with delirium, and were removed only by the use of powerful stimulants and the application of heavy clothing; these produced a profuse perspiration, which left me in a most lamentable state of prostration. In January, 1832, these fits had much increased in frequency and force, and after having had three in one week, I resolved to go to Harley Street. I confess I took this resolution without any predilection, and without any great hope; merely as a man in despair tries anything, under a conviction that he has not much to lose. The benefit of your process was immediately apparent. I never had, after I went to you, one shivering fit for which I could not account, nor above three in all; or, to give a strong instance, I, who had been so sensitive that the slightest effusion of blood produced a violent fit, underwent, last spring, a severe and most critical operation, under the hands of Mr. Lawrence, and did not experience the least return of my old malady.

But now, my dear Sir, permit me to add a word of suggestion for your own benefit, and, as I conceive, the good of the community. Your discovery, if it can effect all you propose, ought not to be private property, but should belong to all mankind. I do not mean to say that you are called upon to give away that which ought to be to you the source of wealth and happiness:

the nation ought to purchase it, liberally and even profusely, if its merits can be ascertained. But for this purpose an ample and rigid inquiry should be instituted. It is not to be expected that the country will again be duped as it was when the recipe for a valuable medicine was purchased at a high price, and the inventor and his successors afterward derived vast emolument from the sale of the genuine article, that which had been communicated to the public being obviously defective. The mode of inquiry I should suggest would be this. You should write a full account of your process, which should be locked up in a box, of which you might keep the key. Under the inspection of a Committee, not of medical men alone, but of practical sensible men of business, a certain number of patients in every malady you profess to cure, should be put under your care. These patients should not be altogether composed of those whose cases have been adjudged desperate, but contain a fair average. If the cure failed, your claims would be at an end; but if the Committee reported in your favour, a second trial should then be made of the genuineness of your disclosure. Your recipe should be taken from the box, and impartial and intelligent men should pursue the remedies it directed on all the cases which you had reached. If the result then proved favourable, I cannot but think that Government would have made a most beneficial compact in obtaining that which not only would afford relief and solace to so many in all conditions, but would reduce the expenditure of communities, of parishes, of hospital funds to so great a degree, and would be of such immense benefit to the army and navy, in ships, and in garrisons.

I beg pardon for intruding on you this suggestion,

which I hope you will believe arises from a sincere wish to place your pretensions in a proper light, and a desire that the benefits I have received may be extended to many—to all.

I remain, my dear Sir,
Yours most truly,
JOHN ADOLPHUS[1].

J. St. John Long, Esq.

To a valued nobleman (Lord Ingestre) I owe much for the investigation he has bestowed upon my system. With that ardour for the elucidation of truth which is the inborn passion of well-constituted minds, Lord Ingestre had previously satisfied himself, through every channel of inquiry, that numerous cases pronounced hopeless of success had yielded to the action of my remedies; and that if I did not inspire the vigour of health into all, none were dismissed unrelieved.

His Lordship's letter to a patient of mine, when distance prevented a personal interview, a copy of which has been sent me by S. Wilding, Esq., will point out the impartial course he has taken.

London, May 25, 1829.

SIR,

Although I am unacquainted with you, I take the liberty of writing to you on the subject of Mr. Long, of Harley Street, under whose care I understand you were

---

[1] A document from this eminent author and lawyer, on the properties of my remedies, may be seen among the Testimonials.

some time ago. I have seen much of his system, and am desirous of investigating the matter thoroughly, thinking that, on the one hand, if his practice be a beneficial one, and on the other hand, if it be an imposition, in either case the sooner it is made generally known to the public the better; and whatever may be the result of my inquiries I am determined shall in due time be made known. Under these circumstances, I hope you will pardon the liberty I take in asking you to send me a statement of your disease, the period of its commencement, and what was the result of Mr. Long's practice, both at the time and since you have left him; and also the opinion of medical men, both before and after your attendance on Mr. Long. Should you have no objection, I should be obliged to you to state that you would be willing to make oath to what you state to me. Pardon the trouble I put you to, but ascribe it to motives to elicit the truth on this important subject.

Your obedient servant,

INGESTRE[1].

To S. Wilding, Esq., All Stretton, Shropshire.

5, Mansfield-street, June 20, 1829.

SIR,

As I am leaving England for some time, I wish to send you some letters from persons that have been under your care; and you have my permission to make use of them in any way, provided you have that also of

---

[1] Another letter from Lord Ingestre, in approbation of my system, may be seen among the Documents.

the individuals themselves. These letters, as you know, were written to me by persons whom I had requested to make known their cases to me in writing, that I might form a judgement of your system. I am willing to bear ample testimony to the fact of your having extracted a fluid like mercury from the head of one of your patients in my presence on one or two occasions[1]; and I think it but justice to add, that in the various cases I have seen under your hands, it is my conviction you effected cures of many, benefited most, and at all events did harm to none.

If these remarks can be of any use to you, as being those of an eye-witness, and of one who has studied to arrive at the truth, I hope you will make what use you please of them.

I am your obedient servant,

INGESTRE.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

---

[1] Some censorious observations have been made with respect to this fact, but particularly upon the words "a fluid like mercury"; as if the extracting a fluid influenced or impregnated with the metallic substance from the cranium should be considered impossible, while the administering mercury in blue pill, &c., is deemed a salutary and scientific operation. Surely, whatever corrosive substance is administered must be taken up by the absorbents, and conveyed into the circulation; otherwise the body could not be generally influenced by the destructive effects of salivation. The bones would not become carious, nor would so many new diseases have arisen. Sarsaparilla would not be recommended by the faculty for the removal of this deleterious substance; nor would traces of it be found in the brain of those who prepare it, nor in the bath of the patient. The gentleman alluded to took so much mercury in blue pill, that it rendered him insane.

I here call the reader's attention to the extract from the *Athenæum* and *Lancet* of February 26, 1831, in note [2], page 29, *ante*, which corroborates the case mentioned by Lord Ingestre, even by *the medical men themselves.*

London, January 29, 1834.

Mr. Long having appealed to me for my present opinion of his discovery, I feel it a duty I owe to the country, to state that the opinions I have formerly publicly expressed, I entertain now with increased confidence, not only from the vast accession to the number of cures he has performed, but also from the permanency of some of his earlier cures being now, after a period of nearly six years, fully established.

INGESTRE.

ON

THE PROPERTIES OF THE LOTION,

AND ITS BENEFICIAL EFFECTS.

We the undersigned, having been patients of Mr. St. John Long, and having had his Lotion applied to us, do declare, That no blisters were ever raised upon us by it, and that we never heard of its producing them upon any of his patients: That the irritation created by his Lotion heals again under its daily application: That we have used the same to our faces, hands, and other parts of the body, and that it will produce a discharge on diseased parts, while it takes not the slightest effect on any other. Many of us have also held it in the mouth, and swallowed it with impunity. We have further to add, That we never knew an instance of mortification taking place under its use, and believe it almost impossible that such an effect could be produced by Mr. Long's Lotion.

M. Ashworth. 3, *Hall-place, St. John's Wood.*
Caroline Rooke. 3, *Hall-place, St. John's Wood.*
S. H. Oughton. *Marsden-square, Manchester.*
Jane Macdougall. *Guernsey.*
Jane Campbell. *Woolwich.*

J. Fortye. *Guernsey.*

Maria Grindlay. 30, *North Bank, Regent's Park.*

William Conway. 8, *North-street, Manchester-square.*

Thomas Fussell. *Mills, Frome, Somerset.*

J. Spottiswoode. *George-street, Westminster; Spottiswoode, Louder, N. B.*

William Abington. *East India House.*

Louis Vercellini. 13, *North Bank, Regent's Park.*

J. Macdonald. *Bensham Lodge, Croydon, Surrey.*

Ellen Gregory. *Shackelwell.*

S. Southeby. 7, *Charlotte-street, Bloomsbury.*

George Manley (for his infant daughter). *Holywell-street, Strand.*

Ingestre (Viscount, M.P.).

S. Ottley. *Devonshire-street.*

M. G. Prendergast (M.P.). *George-street, Hanover-square.*

Rosetta Prendergast. *George-street, Hanover-square.*

James G. Waddall (Major). 24, *Devonshire-street.*

Harriet Page. *Meeting-street, Ramsgate.*

M. F. Christian. 6, *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*

William Hodges. 12, *Paper Buildings, Temple.*

Jane Bury. 1, *Orchard-street, Portman-square.*

H. Hoghton (Commander, R.N.). *Park-place, Paddington.*

G. L. Ormonde (The Marchioness of).

Robert Burke. *Kildare-street, Dublin.*

Richard Stewart (Rector of *Kildress, Co. Tyrone*).

Reginald J. Blewitt. *Monmouth.*

T. J. Thompson. 6, *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*

Mary Dutton. *Hastings.*

E. Tulk Hart. 19, *Duke-street, Westminster.*

A. M. Lowndes. 23, *Hans-place, Sloane-street.*

Henry Musters. *Grenadier Guards.*

A. Sanders,—*June* 1, 1831.

H. W. Butler (Lady H.).

J. W. Coke,—*July* 6, 1831.

H. Bourne, R.N.,—*August* 10, 1831.

William Barron,—*July* 19, 1831.

T. Montgomery,—*Sept.* 14, 1833. *Beech-hill, Antrim, Ireland.*

March 27, 1831.

I am persuaded, that *had I left* Mr. Long during the time the discharge was being produced, mortification would have taken place; whereas, *by continuing the application, the same lotion healed the sore originally made by it, when there was no more disease in the part.*

(Signed) R. F. Gambier, R.N.

New Road, March 24, 1831.

This is to certify, that the irritation produced by Mr. Long's application, or lotion, created *a discharge from the diseased parts,* whilst *the same applied to the sound portions had not the slightest effect* whatever; and that the irritation *healed again by the daily employment of the same remedy*; and that I never knew an instance of mortification arise from its adoption, or any dangerous effects whatever.

(Signed) John Braithwaite.

36, Bryanstone-square, London, May 3, 1831.

I beg to state that I was five weeks under the care of Mr. St. John Long, for inflammation in the eyes and nose, and during that time had his lotion daily applied to my face, and put into my eyes. It produced no irritation, except in the part affected, and drew off the inflammation, without making a sore, so effectually, that I am now enabled to see as well as ever I did in my life.

M. A. Colville.

I have, through the kindness of Mr. Long, possessed some of his lotion, which I have frequently used in various cases with uniform success, and vouch for the truth of the foregoing statements.

G. S. Ormonde (Marchioness of).

July 3, 1831.

I have seen all the effects above described produced by Mr. Long's lotion, and am quite convinced of its utility and innocence, though I have only inhaled, myself.

Sligo (Marquis of).

Castle Browne, Co. Kildare,
July 19, 1831.

I have daily applied Mr. Long's lotion to my back and chest for the last month, and no discharge has been produced by its use, while the same application, from the same bottle, produced it upon others.

P. W. Browne.

Longford, Derby, July 21, 1831.

About eight weeks since I placed myself under Mr. Long's care for an enlarged knee-joint, originating in a violent strain. In the first month, during which time I made daily application of Mr. Long's lotion, the latter made no visible impression on the outward surface of the skin, but in one week the joint of the knee was formed. At the end of the month and up to the present moment a discharge has been produced, and continued by the same application, attended by a considerable reduction of the enlarged joint and increased freedom in using it.

J. W. Coke.

Bensham House, Surrey,
July 22, 1831.

I have had the lotion applied all over my infant for fever from teething, which it removed immediately, and produced no discharge whatever. The same lotion was also applied to my face, and produced a discharge from one temple, where erysipelas had been three years previous, and took not the slightest effect on any other part of the face.

Helen Macdonnald.

August 10, 1831.

I have great satisfaction in stating that the bronchial affection for which I thought it necessary to consult you, has been completely removed by the application of your remedies. I cannot but add, that from my experience of the effects of your remedies, and from

what I have witnessed in the cases of others who were under your care during my course of attendance, I should not have the smallest hesitation in again placing myself under your care, in the event of my being similarly affected.

H. Bourne, R.N.

John St. John Long, Esq.

London, August 6, 1831.

My son, a boy of ten years of age, has been afflicted since he had the measles (now nearly two years) with violent inflammation of the eyes, and a film covering them, which appeared to affect his sight to a very alarming degree. When I placed him under your care he could not look at the light without his eyes streaming water; and I was obliged to discontinue his studies, as whenever he looked at a book, he saw (as he described it) the letters double, and a mist covering the book. In this distressing state I applied to you, and I am happy to say that under your care his eyes have almost got quite well: he can now read for hours without the slightest inconvenience, and the most brilliant light does not affect them. The course you pursued was inhaling, and washing his face and body with your lotion for some days; you then caused a discharge from his temples, and you put the same lotion that caused the discharge into his eyes every day for the last two months. To this course of treatment the disease of the eyes has yielded; and although he had no constitutional malady when I placed him under your care, he had a languor which made me very uneasy. I am happy to say his strength is now perfectly re-

stored; and I may say that he is at this moment in the enjoyment of perfect health, for which I feel most grateful to you.

JANE C. MACDOUGALL.

November 15, 1831.

I certify that Mr. St. John Long's lotion has been applied to my chest; that the application produced a discharge, which gradually decreased under a repetition of such application, until the part from whence the discharge proceeded became perfectly healed.

(Marquess of) ORMONDE.

London, January 13, 1832.

I certify that Mr. St. John Long's lotion has been applied to my chest and side; that it produced a discharge, which gradually healed under a repetition of the application.

(The Viscount) HARRIS,
Major-General.

Mullybrack, Market Hill, Ireland,
January 31, 1832.

I have much pleasure in stating that my health, which had for a long time been very indifferent, and for which I had in vain consulted several physicians of eminence, has been restored under the care of Mr. St. John Long, without pain or any disagreeable application. I think it also due to Mr. Long to state, that during my attendance upon him I have witnessed

several remarkable cures performed by his system, and none in which it did not appear to have afforded relief. The means which he applies I believe to be perfectly safe, producing no effect except upon those parts which are affected by disease.

SAMUEL BLACKER.

Brockport, Holywood, Ireland.

I have had every opportunity of witnessing the extraordinary effects of Mr. Long's embrocation upon his patients, and I can with much sincerity give my evidence in confirmation of the foregoing statement[1]. As to myself, I have been for many years an invalid, and my medical attendant considered my case HOPELESS. I am thankful to be able to state that, under the blessing of Providence, by inhaling, and the use of the embrocation, I am so much recovered that I am enabled to return home in the enjoyment of good health.

JANE R. TURNLEY.

St. John Long has cured the Rev. Dr. Blacker of complaints which baffled London and Dublin.

J. F. (Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ferns.)

To Dr. Macarthney, M.D.

April 28, 1832.

A barrister named Smyth, being incredulous in the belief that Mr. Long's lotion will take no effect where there was no disease, I allowed him to make an appli-

---

[1] In reference to the properties of the lotion.

cation upon my leg by way of experiment. Mr. Smyth took off his coat, and with a sponge applied the lotion for at least twenty minutes or half an hour, until he became quite exhausted with the exertion of rubbing, and failed to produce any effect. Mr. Long's assistant used the application with less violence than Mr. Smyth did. A discharge of humour was produced from my back on the same day by the use of the same lotion for a period of eight minutes. I have invariably found the lotion take effect where there is pain and inflammation, and is quite inoperative where there is an absence of it. I have been a patient of Mr. Long's for seven months, and have had the lotion applied daily with the best effect.

ROBERT BURKE.

We have experienced the effects of the lotion, which are precisely similar to those mentioned in the foregoing statements. We are persuaded of its great powers and of its perfect harmlessness.

Sept. 12, 1832.	HENRY BARRY.
	HENRY RAVENHILL. Clapham Common.
	WM. B. RAVENHILL. Clapham Common.
Albany, Nov. 15, 1833.	E. GIBBS, Colonel.
Nov. 18, 1833.	C. A. LEWIS, Captain Queen's Bays.
Nov. 27, 1833.	J. SHORTALL, Major-General.
Nov. 27, 1833.	A. WATSON, Colonel R.A.

Gladwood, near Melrose,
Scotland.

During the short time I attended daily at your house, I had much satisfaction in witnessing the extraordinary effects of your lotion, as described in the foregoing statements, and its beneficial results upon friends of mine. I only inhaled, myself, for eighteen days, and derived benefit which has proved lasting.

George Spottiswoode,
Lieut.-Colonel.

Temple, December 18, 1832.

It is nearly a twelvemonth since I became a patient of Mr. St. John Long, and in that period I have had ample opportunity of observing, as well as experiencing, the application and effect of his lotion. I observed with vigilance, and something like suspicion, because I had heard it said by eminent medical practitioners that it was impossible the same lotion should pass harmless over the healthy, and yet act upon the unhealthy part of the human frame; and because I had heard it more than insinuated by one or two medical practitioners who were not eminent, that some juggle or trick was played off to make noble and respectable individuals believe that the same composition could be so differently applied as to effect. From my observation and experience I am enabled positively to affirm, that the fact is as Mr. Long and his witnesses have stated. I have seen saucers filled with the lotion, the bottle containing it put away, the practitioner absent, and his assistant with only one supply of liquid in the room, and without ever parting with the sponge from his hand, producing the

desired irritation on one part of the patient, while other parts, even with a more vigorous application, exhibited not even an extraordinary redness; and I have, while watching its progress with eager attention, experienced the same effects myself.

JOHN ADOLPHUS.

London, December 18, 1832.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. St. John Long for about two years, and have had many opportunities of observing his practice, and witnessing the successful results of his skill. I have carefully and narrowly watched the mode of application, and the effects of Mr. Long's lotion obtained from the same bottle on various persons, and on different parts of the body at the same time, and I can therefore confidently affirm that it is harmless on those parts where there is no disease, and attractive or irritative where the humours are in a morbific or inflammatory state. I have also experienced the benefit of this extraordinary lotion in my own person. I was afflicted with severe rheumatic pains in my right leg for several years, which at length caused a considerable swelling from my ankle to my knee. I felt excruciating and almost incessant pain; I could not sleep by night; I had not rest by day: in short, I was suffering unceasing agony. I consulted Mr. Long, and was advised to try the effects of his lotion. After the first two applications a discharge was produced in my leg a little above the ankle. The discharge continued for upwards of two months; but when the discharge ceased, the pain also ceased. I gradually recovered my health and strength, and am now not only

free from pain, but in as good a state of health as I ever was in the course of my life.

As to the testimonies of the numerous and distinguished persons who have verified the successful treatment of Mr. Long, they can receive no additional weight from my corroboration; but this I may be permitted to say, that I have conversed with a great many of these patients, and have not only heard the particulars of their different cases from their own lips, but have also witnessed in several instances the successful results of Mr. Long's application. Mr. Long has cured not fewer than twenty persons whom I knew, and whom some of the leading members of the faculty have pronounced to be incurable.

T. J. Alexander,
Standard Office, Liverpool.

---

91 Wimpole Street, Dec. 24, 1832.

I am happy to subscribe my name in full corroboration of the foregoing statements of the wonderful effects of Mr. Long's lotion, and also of the inhaling process. I have derived considerable benefit in a case which medicine could never effect, and my medical attendants said it was impossible that I could be restored.

Emma Shew.

London, February 7, 1833.

Having derived great benefit from Mr. St. John Long's lotion in the immediate removal of a severe attack of lumbago, and having seen it applied with great advantage to several of his patients, I beg leave to add my

testimony to the utility of that remedy, and to such of the foregoing statements as have fallen within my own observation. I also beg leave to add, that I have seen it produce an immediate effect upon parts which appeared to be diseased, and that I have seen it fail to produce any effect, although applied with more violence to parts not diseased.

M. SHAWE,
Lieut.-Colonel.

Elm Grove, Roehampton,
February 8, 1833.

I have great pleasure in adding my testimony to the foregoing statements, and of the extraordinary success which attended Mr. St. John Long's remedies in the cure of my nephew, Mr. S. H. Oughton, from the last stage of a consumption, and when not the SLIGHTEST HOPES OF HIS RECOVERY WERE ENTERTAINED BY HIS MEDICAL ATTENDANTS. *So hopeless was his case considered, that the latter declared their belief that my nephew could not reach London from Manchester* ALIVE. I consider it is a duty which I owe to the public, and to Mr. Long, to state that my nephew was restored to perfect health by the perseverance of Mr. Long's system, and that he has continued quite well till this period. The cure was performed four years since.

Mrs. Oughton has also benefited much in health by her attendance upon Mr. Long; and in a case of inflammation in my eye, Mr. Long applied his remedy by putting his embrocation into it, and thus removed the inflammation in a very few hours.

These cases, added to many others which I have known the faculty had considered as incurable, and in

which I have seen the successful results which have attended the perseverance of Mr. Long's system, induces me to express my conviction of the extraordinary properties of his remedies, and of their efficacy in the cure of disease. I wish to add my belief that there is not the slightest risk in their application.

JAMES HARWICK OUGHTON.

London, February 25, 1833.

It gives me sincere pleasure to add my testimony in favour of the wonderful and beneficial effects produced by Mr. St. John Long's lotion in various cases in which I have seen it applied, as well as in my own person. It has invariably caused a discharge only from a diseased part; and after the inflamed matter has been drawn away, by the daily application of the lotion, the skin will heal under the same daily application, and even increased friction.

A. M. M. GRINDLAY,
30 North Bank, Regent's Park.

6, Blandford-place, Regent's Park.

I beg leave to add my testimony in confirmation of what has been already advanced, having had frequent opportunities of observing the peculiar and much-doubted effects of Mr. Long's lotion, namely, that it will produce a discharge from *diseased* parts, whilst it passes harmlessly over the *healthy* parts of the human frame.

In consequence of the extraordinary cure performed by Mr. Long in the case of Mrs. Thompson, I was induced to put myself under his care. For several months I had been subject to an ulcerated sore throat, for which I consulted a physician of eminence in Liverpool, but his treatment produced not the slightest mitigation of my complaint. On arriving in London, I immediately consulted Mr. Long, who applied his remedies with the most decided success, and I have since had no return whatever of the affection. I had likewise suffered severely from palpitations of the heart, which also yielded to Mr. Long's treatment. I must also state, as a proof of the harmless nature of Mr. Long's lotion, that upon one occasion, when a sore produced by its means had been newly opened on my side, and was then discharging copiously, I was attacked by jaundice; but notwithstanding the high fever it occasioned, the sore preserved throughout the most healthy appearance. It may likewise be important to mention, that the jaundice itself was removed in a remarkably short space of time, and that during its continuance, so beneficial and invigorating did I find Mr. Long's treatment, that I walked every day from my lodgings in Lambeth to Harley-street, altogether a distance of nearly six miles.

T. G. Thompson.

I have had every opportunity of judging of the effects of Mr. St. John Long's lotion, and I am enabled to state, that it only takes effect on diseased parts of the body, and heals the irritation which it has created.

W. Hoghton,
Com^r Royal Navy.

March, 1833.

This is to certify that I attended Mr. St. John Long in consequence of a flow of blood to the head; that I underwent the application of his lotion at three different times; that the discharge was maintained during about a month, after which it dried up, and that I derived advantage from the treatment; and further, that the same lotion was rubbed over my head without producing a sore, or other inconvenience.

CHRISTOPHER NEVILLE,
Lieut.-General, R.A.

2, Wilton Crescent, Belgrave-square,
March 16, 1833.

The gout having settled in my hand, I applied to Mr. Long, who removed it by the application of his remedy, without causing the least excoriation, and with the perfect cure of the disorder.

GEORGE EVANS BRUCE.

London, March 15, 1833.

I feel much pleasure in adding my testimony in confirmation of the foregoing statements, having had all Mr. Long's remedies entrusted to my charge during his severe illness, and for a period of nine months, except for a short time that they were under the care of the Marchioness of Ormonde. Under these circumstances, I had an opportunity of witnessing their beneficial effects upon his patients, as well as upon my own children; and in every case I can bear evidence that the lotion takes effect upon diseased parts only, drawing

away humour, while it has no other effect than that of a feeling of refreshment on the healthful parts; that I have constantly seen it applied all over the face, chest, back, arms and sides, producing only a reviving sensation: a discharge only takes place where disease is seated. The consequence of persevering in those remedies has been the cause of much happiness to me, as two of my children have been restored to perfect health; and, through the blessing of God, am enabled to return home with my children quite recovered.

A. Hill.

Donnybrook, Donneraile, Ireland.

4, George-street, Hanover-square,
March 15, 1833.

I am enabled by personal experience, and a close observation of Mr. St. John Long's practice for upwards of three years, to add my testimony in confirmation of some of the important facts exhibited in the foregoing testimonials, particularly as regards the characteristic properties of Mr. Long's lotion. From my own personal experience, and the effects I have seen produced on several members of my family, and, indeed, from my observations on Mr. Long's treatment of upwards of one hundred patients, I can assert that his lotion, when applied to a diseased part, speedily produces the desired effect of extracting a considerable discharge of what was termed acrid matter, whilst, if applied to parts free from disease, it always failed to extract any matter, let the friction be ever so great, and only occasioned a redness on the skin, which almost immediately disappeared.

In regard to the rumours which were circulated,

stating that danger attended the application of this lotion, I feel thoroughly convinced that such reports were utterly unfounded; for I have not only seen and felt it applied, as above stated, without the least injury or inconvenience, but I have known very delicate persons, of both sexes, swallow this lotion (a table spoonful at a time,) without the slightest ill consequence.

M. G. Prendergast.

I repaired to London in the autumn of the year 1830, for the express purpose of consulting Mr. St. John Long for a grievous incessant pain in my head, which had baffled all medical prescriptions. His lotion was applied where I considered the malady lay, without its producing any effect. Mr. Long was then obliged to break fresh ground on the forehead, where there was considerable throbbing; and on the third application so extraordinary a discharge of serous matter was produced, as to astonish the rubber and Mr. Long, and such of his patients as were then present. This abated my pain surprisingly, and also had the effect of inducing two successive nights' refreshing sleep, and which I had not experienced for eighteen years. On attending the next morning, as usual, I had the mortification to learn that Mr. Long was obliged to postpone, for a time, any further personal attention to my case, in consequence of a recent calamitous occurrence, and which I soon discovered was laid hold of to injure his reputation, if not to endanger his life. Having neither interest nor connexion of any sort to enable me to stay the prejudice which was manifestly exciting against him (Mr. Long), and having delayed until the

last day of November, without again seeing Mr. Long, and my renewed leave having been limited to that time, I returned to Ireland, afflicted with sorrow that my friend and able adviser should have fallen into the hands of such implacable enemies, but entertaining a confident hope that he would ultimately and triumphantly upset their malice, and that he might at some future day end that which he had so well begun, by the restoration of my health.

(Signed) J. Shortall,
Major-General.

A second trial of Mr. Long's remedies affords me the gratifying opportunity of again giving testimony of their efficacy in my case. After a lapse of three years, I recommenced with Mr. Long on the 9th of October last; and by steadily adhering to his system in daily practice, I feel now not only relieved, but steadfastly trust am perfectly cured (restoration of vision in my right eye excepted, which was not expected), after an endurance of thirty-five years' affliction, the last seventeen years of which I suffered considerable agony from pain and inflammation in the head, and am now at the advanced age of between seventy and eighty.

Signed by my hand at Harley-street, London,
this 25th day of November, 1833,

J. Shortall,
Major-General.

78, Baker-street, Portman-square,
March 25, 1833.

Having attended Mr. St. John Long for some time, I had an opportunity of witnessing the effect of his lo-

tion on my own person. I had been troubled with headache and a fullness in the head for some months, and hearing one of Mr. Long's patients say he had experienced great comfort in having his forehead rubbed with the lotion, I requested Mr. Long to rub the lotion to my head. Scarcely had the sponge with the lotion touched my forehead, when inflammation appeared on the part, and a discharge was produced from a spot between the right eye and temple, which continued for some days, the part being rubbed daily with the lotion and sponge. The inflammation gradually increased towards the centre of the forehead, extending itself over the left eye, returning again towards the centre; and this continued for about three months, during which period, as the inflammation changed its position, the parts that had before yielded a copious discharge of what may be called acrid matter, healed under the same application which had produced the discharge in the first instance. The inflammation then ceased, and no mark whatever remains.

SEBRIGHT MAWBY,
Major-General.

Burlington Hotel.

DEAR SIR,

While in attendance at your house, with other members of my family, I was induced to try your remedies for the removal of a pain I had between my shoulders. I should observe that my pulse was never lower than ninety. The first application of your remedies that was made to my back produced a flow of humour which surprised me very much, as I conceived that I had none. However, the discharge continued for a week,

without any further application; the pain left my shoulders, and the pulse lessened in number, and continues in that state up to the present time. A second application was made some time after, but the flow of humour was considerably less. It is singular that while the discharge continued there was not the slightest appearance of inflammation, nor did I feel any sensation of weakness.

Your sincere and grateful friend,

(Lady) H. Kavanagh.

Hall-place, St. John's Wood.

My dear Sir,

I feel much pleasure in giving my testimony in favour of your system. In the spring of 1830 I was taken ill with fever, shiverings, and a bad sore throat. The surgeon who attended me kept me in my bed two days, and gave the usual remedies in those cases, but the disorder continued to increase till my whole mouth and tongue were ulcerated. The third day I sent, and begged you would call and see me, which you did, and applied your remedy to my throat. After rubbing it about five minutes, the pain had entirely left me; before bed-time I was enabled to swallow with perfect ease; and by the next morning had not the least fever, pain, or any illness left. Shortly after, my housekeeper was taken ill in the same way, but with a more ulcerated throat than mine. I lost no time in taking her to your house, and had her throat rubbed a few minutes, when she lost all pain in swallowing, and by the next day was free from fever, and told me that she should not have known she had been ill. I beg to

say, that one of the under servants had a similar attack at the same time, and preferred calling in a surgeon: she kept her bed a week, and was at least another in recovering her strength.

I remain, your most obedient,

(Lady) M. Ashworth.

London.

Dear Sir,

Deeply indebted to your valuable discovery, that, under Providence, has been the means of restoring to me the inestimable blessing of health, of which I had been deprived for the last four years, allow me to offer you my most grateful thanks, and to join my name very sincerely to the number of your truly obliged friends.

M. J. O'Connor,
5, Great Denmark-street, Dublin.

24, Grafton-street.

Dear Sir,

I have much pleasure in expressing my thanks to you for the great relief your treatment has given to me. When I first sent to you, my throat was very much ulcerated and in a high state of inflammation, which had been very troublesome, more or less, for the last three years; but now the inflammation is subsided, and my general state of health is much improved.

I am, Dear Sir,
Your very obliged Servant,

Henry Pelham Heneage.

Walmer, Kent.

That the lotion takes effect on the diseased parts, and after it has extracted the morbific humour from those parts has no further effect on them, though rubbed for several minutes, I can testify; and that the parts heal again under the daily action of the lotion.

JOHN T. BRIDGES.

Vauxhall, April 4, 1833.

I have in vain endeavoured to create a discharge from different parts of my body with the lotion, and am convinced it has no effect, except upon an affected part. The constant application of the same lotion created a discharge from between my shoulders, and afterwards completely healed it.

CHARLES L. FRANCIS.

Steep-hill Castle, Isle of Wight,
May 6, 1833.

Having in my own person experienced the utmost benefit from Mr. Long's system, and witnessed the same application extended to others, in various cases, with extraordinarily eminent success, during the two months I submitted myself to the care of that gentleman, I should consider that I was failing in justice to him, and in proper feeling for the pains and maladies of others, were I to withhold my testimony in favour of his invaluable discovery.

J. HAMBROUGH.

P.S. I can further testify, that where no morbific

humour exists, the lotion will take no effect, but that diseased parts only will be affected by it; and that those will heal under the daily application of the same remedy, after the extraction of the humour. J. H.

G. W. Wilgress, 57, *Harley-street.*
A. Fleming, *Greenville, Waterford.*
Amelia Thompson, *Blandford-place, Regent's Park.*
George Atkinson, *Queen's College, Oxford.*

Mells, Frome, Somerset,
March 22, 1831.

I have pleasure in bearing testimony that Mr. Long's remedy takes effect on diseased parts only, by drawing away a humour, while it produces no effect whatever upon the *healthy.* Mrs. Fussell had suffered much, for upwards of ten years, from hepatic derangements, and the disease appeared to be gradually degenerating, for it had taken on those symptoms which usually mark approaching consumption to an alarming extent. In this state was she when I placed her under Mr. Long's care; and I most unequivocally declare that her case was considered almost a lost one, and many of my own friends, as well as myself, looked upon it as a forlorn hope, but considered it a duty not to leave a stone unturned, so long as the remotest prospect appeared of getting good. I shall just touch upon my daughter's case. From the time of her losing the measles she suffered severe pain in the left ear, which, after a while, discharged a good deal of matter, and eventually she became quite deaf in it. In these circumstances I entrusted her also to Mr. Long's care, and he caused a

general discharge from the upper part of the head till the disease was removed. With regard to myself, I had not for many years been without headache, accompanied with violent pains in my stomach, and at times otherwise very unwell. Mrs. Fussell and my daughter were in attendance at Mr. Long's five months, and I not as many weeks; and I rejoice to say they are both perfectly recovered from their afflictions, and as to myself, I have neither ache nor pain. I ought to remark that before Mrs. Fussell went to Mr. Long's as a patient, she was almost in the daily habit of taking calomel, blue pill, colocynth, or something of the kind prescribed; but I conscientiously believe she has not taken six pennyworth of medicine during the last eleven months. And to conclude, I assert, without hesitation, that I attribute the whole benefit which we have individually received, with the blessing of the Almighty, to Mr. Long's skill, kindness, and perseverance; and as long as I live I hope to be sensible of it.

THOMAS FUSSELL.

Chiddingfold, Godalming, Surrey,
June 11, 1833.

No one had a better opportunity of judging the extraordinary properties of Mr. Long's remedies than I had, (and no one can feel more grateful than I do for the benefits I derived from their use,)—that the lotion takes effect on unsound parts, by drawing away a humour, and has no more effect than cold water on the healthy parts. No one who has ever seen it used can for a moment doubt of the truth of the foregoing statements. I speak from experience. It is five years

since I consulted Mr. Long, when suffering in the last stage of consumption. My expectoration was copious and offensive, and frequently mixed with blood; I had severe pain in my chest and sides, sickness, retching, and profuse perspirations, which reduced me to an alarming state. My friends and myself expected that I should have died under the effects of throwing off the expectorated matter, and those of Mr. Long's patients who sat in the room with me complained of the offensive smell they had to endure. I name this circumstance that others may benefit by the same means which (under Heaven) saved my life, and removed every symptom of my complaint, for, when I consulted Mr. Long, I was considered hopeless by

Dr. Walshman,
Dr. Bristow,
Dr. Woodger;

and when Dr. Gordon, who did not attend me, saw me, on my return from London, run up stairs, perfectly recovered, he exclaimed, "A miracle!! a miracle!!!"

I have to add, that I am now the mother of two fine healthy children, and, with the exception of an attack of fever, have continued to enjoy the most perfect health up to the present moment, and am able to ride on horseback several miles.

SARAH WEBB,
late ENTICKNAP.

Royal Hibernian Military School,
Phœnix Park, Dublin.
August 6, 1833.

Having had an opportunity of judging of the effects produced by Mr. Long's lotion, and his system of in-

haling, I feel it my bounden duty to testify that I consider these remedies capable of being employed in a great variety of cases with almost an absolute certainty of success. The lotion, when applied to parts exhibiting an appearance of disease, uniformly and rapidly produces a discharge of offensive matter, which continued, if the lotion were regularly used, until no more remained, when the part assumed a healthy appearance, and the very application which produced the sore seemed to assist in the process of healing. This I have experienced in my own, and witnessed in so many other instances, that it is perfectly impossible I could be mistaken. There were frequently in the practice-room at Harley-street, three or four individuals undergoing the application at the same time; and it was the very same lotion which produced a discharge in one case, which assisted in the process of healing in another, and could produce no perceptible effect upon a third, although the rubbing was frequently continued until the actual friction almost caused excoriation. With respect to the inhaling process, I am enabled to state, from personal observation, that its effects have been regularly restorative. It seemed to possess the power of predisposing the system of Mr. Long's patients to be acted upon by the lotion in a more effectual way; so that many from whom no discharge could be obtained at first, after inhaling a few times, discharged most freely. It also had a salutary action on the bowels and kidneys: costiveness was removed by it, in many instances, in the completest manner, and in the most natural way. Ordinary purgations act upon the bowels alone, and give relief by a species of excitation, which is frequently the cause of a new form of disease. Mr. Long's inhaling process

gave relief by invigorating the whole system, and, instead of causing excessive action in any part, rendering the action of every part healthy and natural. It caused the pores to discharge freely, by a kind of perspiration that might be almost called indescribable, a something that was obstructive of health, and by the removal of which the patient felt both his body relieved and his mind exhilarated. The continued influence of Mr. Long's lotion and his inhaling system have produced, to my certain knowledge, upon various individuals now alive and well, effects which might be almost called miraculous, and which I should not have believed had I not actually seen them. I am desirous to add my humble testimony to that of the numerous respectable individuals who have had equal or greater opportunities of seeing the effects of Mr. Long's practice, because I conceive him to be a most persecuted man, and should consider myself in some measure in league with his persecutors if I did not, at this critical moment, come forward and publicly testify what I know of the beneficial effects of his system.

(Rev.) Samuel O'Sullivan.

London, September 1830.

My Dear Sir,

I have much pleasure in performing what you so justly expect from your patients, by rendering to you my acknowledgements of the essential benefit I have derived from your advice and remedies since I consulted you about four months past.

During the preceding year, the ill health, which I had for some time laboured under, gained rapidly on me. I

declined in strength and flesh, had palpitations of the heart, attended by such soreness and irritability that I could not touch that part externally without reluctance.

My stomach was so very much affected that I was assured by my medical attendants that my food passed constantly through my system without digestion, or affording nourishment; and my tongue always presented a white and feverish appearance.

I had also a decided bronchial affection, but have no doubt I was also threatened with disease of the lungs, as I had occasionally pains in my chest and sides, oppression in breathing, quick pulse, expectoration, and fever of skin. I shall now briefly add, that these symptoms have been all removed or mitigated. Before I had been long under your care, the affection of my heart entirely disappeared, and, with the exception of occasional palpitation, has not since returned. I now enjoy better health than I have experienced for several years; and if I could arrange to remain a few more weeks under your care, I am satisfied that my recovery would be perfect.

I beg to express my conviction that you have made an important discovery, applicable to the removal of different ailments, as I have seen patients of yours, differently affected to me, cured by the influence of your remedies; and from what I have observed of the progress of my own case and that of others, and of the various ways in which your system developes itself, I have no doubt that a cure once effected by you is *permanent*.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

PETER O'BRIEN.

(Of Limerick.)

Limerick, August 14, 1833.

After an interval of four years I have the pleasure of meeting Mr. Long on his way through this city. I had already, when leaving London in 1829, testified to that gentleman, by a written document, the beneficial results of his treatment in my restoration to health, and have the present gratification of acknowledging its uninterrupted continuance. I can add my testimony to those which have preceded, of the remarkable operation and properties of his lotion. When attending his practice-room in London, I saw the *same* lotion indiscriminately applied among many patients by ourselves, or by Mr. Long or his attendant. On some it produced occasionally no effect, while on others it caused a discharge from the part of the frame where pain was complained of; but (in the same individual) where there was no pain, no discharge could be produced by the lotion. No possibility existed of deception, or, in those instances where a discharge resulted, of the admixture of any other liquid or substance to the lotion in general use.

What I consider equally remarkable in Mr. Long's *lotion* is, that the sores caused originally by it subsequently healed, though under the daily application of the lotion to them.

PETER O'BRIEN.
Bank Place.

September 12, 1833.

Having been restored to health by Mr. Long's system, I feel it my duty to bear testimony to the extraordinary properties his remedies possess in extracting a humour or thin fluid wherever disease or pain exists, while it

takes no effect on parts that are not diseased. The lotion was applied all over my back, but would only produce a discharge on the lower part of my spine, where I felt the pain and lameness. As the discharge took place, the pain ceased, and I gradually recovered. I continued using Mr. Long's lotion until no discharge could be produced by the remedy, however long it was applied over the part that first yielded to its attraction. I have had no return of my complaint up to this period, now two years.

RICHARD STEWART,
Rector of Kildress, Co. Tyrone.

From the Sunday Times.

Ely Place, May 27, 1831.

SIR,

A paragraph having appeared in most of the newspapers, stating that I had been expelled from the London Medical Society, I beg permission to explain the grounds upon which the Society have resorted to this extraordinary and illiberal procedure.

A short time since, I was, by letter, requested by Mr. St. John Long, whose name has been recently much before the public, to state my opinion as to the medical evidence adduced on his trials in the cases of Miss Cashin and Mrs. Lloyd. Conceiving that, although a member of the Royal College of Physicians, I nevertheless had a right to offer an opinion on any subject with which I was conversant, I did not hesitate to answer Mr. Long's call. I had no motive impelling me to this task but a love of truth and a regard for medical science. I ima-

gined, considering the times in which we live, that no professional man, whether a fellow of a college or a mere probationer in the lower walks of physic, could reasonably object to, or be offended with, any opinion candidly and temperately expressed, although it should happen to be at variance with his own, or the sentiments of an order generally. I consequently wrote a letter to Mr. Long, stating pretty fully my view of the two cases, in which I took occasion to dissent from the mode of treatment adopted by some of the medical attendants. But my attention was more particularly called to the report of a *post mortem* examination of the body of Miss Cashin, from the circumstance of its contrary evidence, which the examinators either did not fully appreciate, or had no opportunity of noticing upon the trial. For many years I had most anxiously devoted myself to the study of morbid anatomy and affections of the chest. From my connexions with two well-known and valuable institutions, I may assert, without vanity, that I have had more opportunities of making myself acquainted with pectoral diseases than any other physician in the metropolis. Satisfied, therefore, that the causes of Miss Cashin's death were not properly developed on the trial by the medical witnesses, I could not resist adverting to them when called upon by Mr. Long. This I did as delicately and as tenderly, for the reputation of others, as possible. I explained the nature of the various symptoms in that lady's case, and what I considered the most probable cause of her death, namely, great irritability of the digestive apparatus, arising from cholera, which was very prevalent at that period. Mr. Long published this letter in his work, whence it found its way into some of the public journals. "This is the head

and front of my offending." For this I have been visited with the anger and, I am sorry to say, the malice, not of any of the respectable members of the profession, but of those whose rank in life renders them callous of obloquy, and whose illiberality is no stain on their reputation. I am therefore happy to record, that though I was expelled from this Society, not one member of eminent reputation or high standing in the profession voted against me. To me this treatment is a matter of perfect indifference, seeing that they condemned me for my honest opinions in a manner more worthy of an alehouse club than a society of learned men, scarcely allowing me to utter a word in my defence: the disgrace falls upon them, not upon me. If they, or the faculty generally, think they are able to restrain me from expressing my opinions, they are much mistaken. But having recorded these sentiments upon Miss Cashin's case, and seeing how fiercely and acrimoniously they were attacked, I was resolved to follow up my inquiries as to the practice of Mr. Long. I was previously satisfied as to the innocency of his lotion; but to remove all grounds on which to found a doubt, and confirm my opinions if right, and retract them if wrong, I requested permission of Mr. Long to see the effects of this lotion when applied to his patients. This was readily granted. I was introduced to his practice-room, saw his patients during the application of his lotion, saw the effects, conversed with several of his patients on the subject, tasted and had the lotion applied to myself, saw it applied to the eyes and the whole face, inquired most particularly as to its effects internally and externally; and having done all this, I am bound in honour to say, that not a doubt remains upon my mind as to its perfect innoxiousness.

I cannot, therefore, hesitate a moment in adding my testimony to that of the late surgeon-general of Jamaica, and the numerous and highly distinguished persons who vouch for its innocency. I feel a pleasure in doing this, because it confirms my former opinions, and shows, that although the faculty refuse to tolerate them, they are founded in truth, and consequently unassailable. I have only to add a word respecting the process of inhalation, which forms a part of Mr. Long's practice. I have seen several patients immediately after they have inhaled, and I have conversed with several others on the subject; and I am perfectly satisfied, not only of its salutary effects, but also of its innocuous nature.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

F. H. Ramadge, M.D.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians.

To the Editor of the Sunday Times.

Enfield, Middlesex, Oct. 28, 1829.

Sir,

I return you my most sincere thanks for the wonderful cure you performed on me. I had the attendance of a medical gentleman and a physician without receiving any benefit from them. My body was reduced almost to a skeleton. I could scarcely walk. I expectorated a large spitoon-full every day: the smell was so offensive that scarce any person could stand near me. I could not lie down in my bed night nor day for three weeks together. My doctor and my family despaired of my life, and I settled all my worldly affairs, as it was

considered that I could not last many days. I must now express my thanks to my doctor, who took me, upon his own account, to consult you, and likewise my family's thanks; wishing you every blessing this world can afford.

Your obedient servant,

THOMAS FORMAN TAYLOR.

To Mr. St. John Long.

From the Marquess of Sligo.

Mansfield Street, July 22, 1830.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have much pleasure in acceding to your wish, that I should state to you my opinion of your mode of treatment. In the first place, as far as relates to myself, I have to say, that I came to you reduced to the greatest state of lassitude, low spirits, and general debility from gout, and the effect of the strong sedative medicines which I had recourse to, to allay the paroxysms when they came on. In a very short time after I had commenced your system, all those symptoms vanished, and I am happy to say that for ten years I have not experienced such perfect health as I have from that period. Whether a recurrence of gout will be prevented or not, I can as yet form no idea, nor can you be blamed if it does return, in as much as I did not try the whole of your system. I only inhaled, and did not make use of the exterior application. I have now ceased for some time to attend you, and must say that I deem myself fortunate in having met with you.

As to your treatment of other complaints, I can only

say that I never saw any harm done, and that the cures which I have myself witnessed, or heard of from the patients themselves, then in attendance on you, have perfectly astonished me. All those persons whom I have brought to you to see the process going on, have said that my statements were far under the opinions they had themselves formed from personal inspection.

My dear Sir,

Very truly yours,

SLIGO.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Harley Street, London,
June 5, 1830.

MY DEAR MR. LONG,

It is with heartfelt gratitude I take up my pen to thank you, before leaving town, for restoring me to health and to my young family. Words fall short in expressing what I owe to you.

After nine years' acute suffering from pain in the right side, (for which the most eminent medical men, both in London and Dublin, were consulted, without my receiving the least benefit from their prescriptions,) my general health was completely injured by the quantity of medicine I had recourse to, and the digestive power much weakened. So acute has the pain been at times, *that I have prayed to be relieved from my sufferings by death.*

I was first induced to try your system from an account my husband read in one of the papers of your method of treating one of your patients, which we knew was not correct; and at that time a friend of mine was

attending you, and received the greatest benefit; I therefore lost no time in placing myself under your directions. On my leaving home, no one that saw me ever expected I could be cured. My brother*, and other members of my family, are perfectly astonished at the happy change six months of your treatment has produced.

My disease you have proved, beyond a doubt, to have been an abscess. In short, my dear Sir, life is now desirable, as I am in the perfect enjoyment of health; and my whole family join with me in thanking you for it.

My earnest wish now is, that your system may be generally known, and that hundreds of my fellow-creatures, who are at present suffering, may hear of you, go to you, and be cured, as I have been; and wishing you that success which your excellent discovery merits,

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Your grateful patient, and sincere friend,

JANE A. G. FORTYE.

John St. John Long, Esq.

Woolwich, September 7, 1828.

MY DEAR SIR,

Although my case was not that of consumption, I feel anxious to afford my testimony to the benefit I have received from your treatment, and the efficacy of the great discovery you have made. I forward you a statement of my case. I had been for a length of time suffering from an irritating cough (particularly on rising in the morning), attended by indigestion and loss of ap-

* General Sir Colin Campbell, K.C.B.

petite; great heat in the palms of my hands, and dryness of the tongue at night. These symptoms became worse during the winter, and continued increasing: my sleep was restless and broken, with the continued increase of expectoration, which had now changed to a purulent appearance. My body performed none of its natural functions, and was daily losing strength and substance.

In the month of May I happened to see your name in the *John Bull*, and lost no time in my application to you, and very soon experienced the good effects of what I think I may call one of the greatest discoveries that has been made for the relief of human nature.

That your exertions may be attended by the success you so justly merit, is the sincere wish of,

My dear Sir,

Yours most truly,

A. Watson,
Colonel, Royal Artillery.

P.S. You are at liberty to make such use of this as you may deem necessary.—A. W.

In addition to my former document I have the pleasure to add, that I continue in good health this 27th day of November, 1833.

A. Watson,
Colonel.

London, September 12, 1828.

My dear Sir,

I regret extremely that circumstances have intervened to debar me the gratification of further discussing with you the merits of Mr. Long's system. A person

of your high intellectual endowments and capability of discriminating between right and wrong, between the ignorant pretensions of an illiterate and vulgar empiric, and the original and vivid perceptions of a man of genius, is well fitted for your discussions, and many useful and valuable ideas, I have no doubt, would have been conveyed to me.

The extravagant views entertained by some persons, who imagine every case of pulmonary disease curable by Mr. Long's means, I presume are not entertained by you, and certainly never encouraged by Mr. Long himself, who is frequently under the painful necessity of rejecting, as patients, those whose strength and stamina are completely exhausted, and nothing left to act upon. But it must be conceded, on the other hand, that where men of the highest professional information and talent have failed to render any benefit, Mr. Long has been extraordinarily and wonderfully successful; witness the case of ————.

* * * * *

In all these instances extreme emaciation, hectic fever, purulent expectoration, and the long and frightful train of symptoms (usually indicative of tuberculated lungs and the approaches of death) were present, but, as you already know, were removed by the means employed by Mr. Long; thereby conferring on them a character and value far beyond all the remedial measures usually prescribed by men more regularly initiated in the profession.

I most anxiously hope, for the sake of suffering humanity, and for the general interest of mankind, that time and further experience will stamp a still higher value on Mr. Long's system, discovery, or whatsoever

else it may be called, and that the anxious wishes and anticipations of his friends and admirers will be more than realized.

With best regards and hopes for your perfect recovery,

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Most sincerely yours,

F. MACARTNEY, M.D.

To ——— ———, Esq.

Richmond Hill, October 23, 1829.

DEAR SIR,

Although I feel it unnecessary to add to the numerous testimonials in your possession relative to the efficacy of your valuable discovery, yet as my case in some respects differs from others, I think it may be satisfactory to your future patients to be made acquainted with the nature of my complaint, and my progress towards cure. I am more especially induced to do so, as it gives me an opportunity of expressing my gratitude, and how sensibly I feel the benefit I have derived while under your care. A very clever medical friend described my complaint to be produced by an irritable state of the lining membrane of the air passage and lungs, under which excitement it put on a nervous action, and produced expectoration of an unhealthy nature. This disorder, extending over the lining membrane of the stomach and bowels, induced a train of evils connected with the torpor of the liver, indigestion, &c. He told me it was generally curable, but sometimes attacked the substance of the lungs; and while it seemed easy to conceive the possibility of a remedy, the means of

reaching such irritation were often unattainable, on account of the difficulty of bringing inward inflammation to the surface. These are nearly his own words. The difficulty he speaks of, you have overcome. Previously to my consulting you, I had suffered six years from a severe cough, originating in a violent cold. During that time I had the first medical advice, which only afforded temporary relief. I was next advised to try foreign climates, which proved equally inefficacious. On my return to London, hearing of your new mode of treatment, so different from any I had tried, I was *forcibly* impressed with the idea that it was such as would reach my complaint; one of the peculiar symptoms of which was, that my nails from the commencement assumed a deep yellow hue. They have now assumed their original healthy appearance. I have nearly lost my cough; my system is very much restored, and has acquired its usual solidity; my strength is much increased, my chest relieved from irritation, my appetite and digestion good, my sleep undisturbed, and I look forward, under Divine Providence, to a permanent re-establishment of health.

If those who are now most opposed to your system were aware of the advantages resulting from the power you possess of extracting inflammation, together with the power of inwardly healing and strengthening, I am persuaded they would see it in a different point of view from what they do at present; and that this period may not be far distant, is the hope of

Your much obliged and sincere well-wisher,

JANE BURY[1].

---

[1] This lady called on me some time since perfectly well.

Marsden Square, Manchester,
July 27, 1829.

My dear Sir,

Esteeming it a duty which I owe to yourself and to the public, allow me to return you my heartfelt thanks for the skill which you have exhibited in the cure of my only son, in a case of consumption; and that, too, when the most eminent of the faculty here had considered his recovery hopeless. Permit me to add, that I shall at any time be most happy to give my testimony to the ability which has been so successful in the recovery of my son. And again requesting your acceptance of a father's best acknowledgements,

I am, dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

Samuel Oughton.

Hertford, July 5, 1829.

My Lord,

With the warmest feelings of gratitude to Mr. St. John Long, and the most earnest desire that his most valuable discovery may be generally known and appreciated, I beg to state to Your Lordship the case of my youngest and only remaining child, Rosa, aged six years, an extremely delicate child, who from the age of ten months suffered under the most distressing symptoms, and was, in the opinion of an eminent physician, decidedly of a consumptive habit. Having beheld my other children sink under the same complaint, I had little hope of being more happy in Rosa, the most delicate.

By the earnest desire of a kind friend I was induced, as a last effort, to consult Mr. Long. She had only been under his care the short space of three months,

when the symptoms gradually disappeared; and, I am truly happy to say, she is now perfectly recovered. She eats heartily, sleeps soundly, and enters into the amusements of her young companions with all the spirit that arises from perfect health. Need I state to Your Lordship the grateful feelings entertained by Mrs. Pemberton and myself towards the discoverer of a remedy which has caused us so much happiness.

I have the honour to be,
Your Lordship's most obedient servant,
JOHN PEMBERTON.

To the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Ingestre.

Extract from Mr. Pemberton's Letter to Mr. Long.

Hertford, June 12, 1830.

.....Rosa sends her kind love to you. She is in the habit of riding out every day; in fact, no child could enjoy better health ever since she left your care, and we shall ever feel most grateful to you for the restoration of our only child.

With grateful acknowledgements,
I remain, dear Sir,
Your very obedient servant,
JOHN PEMBERTON.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

September 27, 1829.

MY DEAR SIR,

It is eighteen months since you performed a perfect cure on my daughter in the space of six weeks, since which time she has had no relapse of her pulmonary disease, nor even taken cold; but she has gone on in-

creasing in health and strength, grown nearly a head taller, and every anxiety is removed.

Yours, ever gratefully,

GEORGE MANLEY.

5, Mansfield Street.

MY LORD,

I regret I was not at home when Your Lordship did me the honour of a visit; but understanding from Mrs. Manley it was Your Lordship's wish that I should state to Your Lordship, by letter, the particulars of the cure of my daughter[1], under the treatment of Mr. St. John Long, I cheerfully embrace the honour of doing so. It is now a year and a half since my child, then nine years old, was taken ill, and gradually evinced symptoms of sinking under that dreadful calamity, consumption. My regular medical advisers having attended her for some time without effecting any change for the better, I was induced to place her under the newly discovered treatment of Mr. St. John Long, who in the short period of a week succeeded in arresting all the symptoms which had alarmed us,—such as constant cough, expectoration, loss of appetite, and loss of flesh,—and in about two months restored her to us perfectly and (from the time that has elapsed, I think I may indulge myself in saying) permanently cured. Trusting Your Lordship may deem this communication sufficiently explicit,

I have the honour to be, My Lord,

Your Lordship's most humble and obedient servant,

GEORGE MANLEY.

To Lord Viscount Ingestre.

---

[1] This young lady continues in perfect health (1834).

34 Montague Square,
June 16, 1830.

Sir,

For some years back I was afflicted with cough, expectoration, shortness of breath, pains in my sides, and general weakness, all of which grew worse until I was placed under your care; previous to which time my expectoration, shortness of breath, cough, perspirations, and waste of flesh, so weakened and reduced me, that I kept my bed two months, which I left, by desire of my master, Colonel M'Neil, to see you, and was not able to walk more than a few hundred yards. All medical skill had failed, and I was assured my lungs were ulcerated. On the 7th of March I came to see you at my master's house; and you had the kindness to receive me as a patient, though, you said, you considered my case almost hopeless, and refused to admit me for some time: however, I can now say that I am restored, so that I have no expectoration, no perspiration, no cough, no dryness of skin, nor any remains of my former complaint. My whole body is changed in colour; I have regained my flesh and strength, and can work for Colonel M'Neil, whose footman I am, as well as I have done for years past. I can never enough thank you for what you have done for me.

John Johnson.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

London, June 23, 1829.

In confirmation of the above statement, I beg to state that I saw Johnson for the first time on the 9th of April, at which period he was much emaciated, was liable to

constant flushings, severe cough and oppression: his expectoration was so distressing, that it was painful to be near him. At this period I consider him in apparent excellent health: he has regained his flesh and strength, and is quite free from the symptoms I first observed in him. I have witnessed the progress of his cure, having been in Mr. Long's practice-room for more than two months.

JAMES O'BRIEN,
Of Limerick.

June 25, 1829.

Having been under Mr. Long's care when Johnson, Colonel M'Neil's servant, first attended him as a patient, I can confirm the above statement of the particulars of his cure.

He was at that time scarcely able to walk, and severely afflicted with the symptoms described by himself; cough, expectoration, severe oppression in breathing: he was also much emaciated and reduced in flesh. I have seen him gradually recover his colour and muscular strength. He now appears free from all his former symptoms, and I consider him in perfect health.

E. DENZA,
From Palermo.

June 26, 1829.

It is scarcely necessary for me to give my evidence in support of the truth of Johnson's statement of his own case, in addition to the evidence of his master, Colonel M'Neil, and others; but having been a patient of Mr. Long's when Johnson first came to him, and as I have daily witnessed the progress of his cure

and restoration to health, under Mr. Long's care, I think my evidence may be somewhat satisfactory, and therefore I corroborate the foregoing statements.

SAMUEL H. OUGHTON,
of Manchester.

34, Montague Square, June 13, 1829.

MY DEAR SIR,

It gives me great pleasure to find my man Johnson so much improved. He tells me, that he has not been so well for several years; that he feels himself quite recovered; and his strength equal to what it has ever been. I need not say how much obliged I am to you for so far departing from your usual practice, in taking him as a patient.

Again let me thank you for your kind attention to my wishes.

I am, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

R. MACNEIL.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Montague Square, Sept. 7, 1829.

MY DEAR SIR,

In reply to your question, I beg to say that my servant continues to perform his duties, and he tells me that he is in good health.

I am, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

R. MACNEIL.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

London, May 22, 1829.

My Lord,

In compliance with your wishes, I shall feel great pleasure in giving Your Lordship a statement of the complaint under which I laboured previous to my attendance on Mr. Long. For some years I had been subject to inflammation of the liver, which rose to so great a degree as to produce indigestion, and an entire derangement of the nervous system, bringing on great debility, and reducing me very much in strength and flesh. I have received different medical advices, which only gave temporary relief, until the period of my attendance on Mr. Long; and I am now happy to say, that all those affections are entirely removed, and that I enjoy perfect health; also I shall be at all times ready to substantiate what I have said, in any way Your Lordship may desire.

I have the honour to remain
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servant,

John T. Evans,
late of Limerick.

To Viscount Ingestre.

P.S. It is now thirteen months since I have been under Mr. Long's care; and I yesterday walked from here to Bromley in Kent, and back again, for amusement.

35, North Bank, Regent's Park.
July 13, 1829.

My dear Sir,

I gladly avail myself of this opportunity of bearing testimony to your skill.

Mrs. Grindlay was seized, in November last, with a

very violent inflammation in her throat (to which she was subject), and which completely prevented utterance, and almost stopped her respiration.

By the application of your remedies, you the same day reduced the inflammation, and she was so much restored, that she went out the following morning to breakfast, and has since been less liable to similar attacks than at any former period of her life.

I remain yours very faithfully,

R. Grindlay.

John St. John Long, Esq.

Bromley, Kent, Sept. 1829.

Sir,

Having received much benefit from your peculiar mode of practice, I will not allow this opportunity to escape of adding my testimony in favour of your invaluable discovery.

Though not suffering from any serious disease, I have for some years past been in such a state of debility, that the slightest fatigue or agitation would occasion a violent headache, accompanied by cold perspirations and loss of voice. My appetite failed, and my hair fell off in handfuls.

I have had advice from the most eminent physicians at different times; but as I experienced only temporary relief from their prescriptions, I concluded that my constitution could not be improved by medicine, and therefore gave up all hope of ever enjoying good health.

A friend of mine, who is indebted to you for her life, induced me to place myself under your care; and, with

feelings of the sincerest gratitude, I now acknowledge my restoration to health and strength.

The remedies you applied in a very short time removed the inflammation from my head, and my hair began to thicken and resume its original strength. My appetite increased, and I entirely lost the depression of spirits which frequently incapacitated me for the enjoyment of my family.

Believe me, ever your much obliged,

MARIA GRINDLAY.

John St. John Long, Esq.

From the Countess of Buckinghamshire.

Montague Square, August 8, 1830.

MY DEAR SIR,

I inclose you a statement of my case as you desired, and am happy to be able to add my testimony to that of your numerous friends.

About six weeks since I was fortunate enough to hear of Mr. St. John Long's system, and having from experience but little faith in the efficacy of medicine, as usually practised, I obtained his address for a relation, who had been suffering many years, without receiving the least benefit from the treatment of her medical advisers.

I accompanied her to Mr. Long's house, and having had some conversation with that gentleman, during which he fully explained his system, I decided upon becoming one of his patients, as well as my friend,

although I had no such intention upon entering his house. I afterwards read a little work which Mr. Long has published upon the subject, wherein I found his opinions perfectly agree with my own, although I had hardly dared to avow them, upon the origin of my disease; but there still remained some doubts in my mind as to the successful result of the treatment proposed. Nevertheless, I continued for some weeks under his care, being convinced that by his method no injury could possibly be done to the constitution; and I am happy to say that I have already got rid of a variety of painful symptoms; as intermitting fever, headache, and lassitude, which, although none of them were serious enough to confine me to my room, were yet sufficiently annoying to throw a gloom over the spirits, and to take away all the enjoyment natural to youth. The health of my friend continues to amend daily; and I have the firm conviction that, in cases hitherto considered fatal, Mr. Long's treatment would, if persevered in, restore to health in a manner almost miraculous.

A. Buckinghamshire.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

From the Right Hon. Viscount Ingestre, M.P.

Gumley, August 9, 1830.

Dear Sir,

It gives me great pleasure, in answer to your application as to the state of my health, to inform you, that although when I underwent the course of your system I was labouring under no disease, I have still derived

benefit from it, and that, at all events, no sort of harm has accrued from it, as my health has been uniformly and uninterruptedly good. I think it but fair to all parties to state this; that, on one side, you may not be thought to have performed a cure where there was none to perform; and on the other, that it should be known that your remedies are at least innocuous, and that in my opinion they are preventive of disease. Since I went through your system I have been much less liable to catch cold, and indeed I cannot recollect having had a cold since that time, although I have not at all guarded against it, but, on the contrary, have been rather free in my exposure to it. I am exceedingly glad to hear that those cures which I witnessed last year remain permanent.

Wishing you every success in your valuable discovery,

I remain, yours truly,

INGESTRE.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Meeting Street, Ramsgate,
Nov. 10, 1830.

DEAR SIR,

Impressed with a deep sense of gratitude, and from that motive willing to counteract any prejudice which may have arisen in consequence of the late trial, I intend to give you a detail of my illness prior to my attendance upon you.

I had been lingering for nearly two years, and had consulted *five* medical gentlemen without success. Their opinions coincided, that if very great care was

not taken I should become consumptive, for I was fast verging towards it. My symptoms were these: pains in my chest and side; expectoration, with much blood; lowness of spirits; restless nights; faintings and shortness of breath; so much so, that I was frequently obliged to rest on ascending a flight of stairs. I had tried every expedient suggested by medical skill, but continued to get weaker and weaker, till, happily, my friends saw the case of Mrs. Webb in one of the London papers, which induced them, as a last expedient, to take me to you. The result was my restoration to health; and I do positively affirm, that I derived much benefit the very first day I attended you.

I am in the continuance of perfect health, and am willing my case should be made publicly known, in gratitude to yourself, and for the benefit of mankind: and while I consider it to be one which clearly proves the efficacy of your mode of treatment, it must be a stumbling-block to those whose prejudices will not render you the merit your skill and treatment justly deserve; though I do hope the time will come when even those will hold you in estimation.

As a witness on your trial, I was ready to affirm, on oath, the benefit I had received; and am now as ready to prove, and give satisfactory evidence to any, should it be required: and if this letter will in anywise benefit you, you have my consent to use it as you please, while

I remain yours, most effectually benefited,

HARRIETT PAGE.[1]

To John St. John Long, Esq.

---

[1] I received a letter from Captain Page about two months ago, in which he stated the marriage of his daughter, and that she was the mother of a family, and going on well.—J. L. April 1834.

The following were the medical gentlemen who attended me, but, failing to afford me any relief, abandoned my case as hopeless:

Dr. Green,
Dr. Daniels,
Dr. Salter,
Dr. Martin,
Dr. Hammond.

17, Charles Street, Nov. 29, 1830.

My dear Long,

I am very happy to be able to relieve your anxiety on my account, by assuring you of my going on remarkably well. My sores have been healed more than a week, and I feel myself stronger every day. I have been troubled with a strong rash in both my legs, which has obliged me to keep on the cabbage-leaves; but it is now nearly gone. I am convinced I only want time to get strength in my legs, and to know how to make use of them, to be as well as I ever was in my life. Thanks to you, my dear Sir, for having accomplished this, which I believe no other person in the world could have done, and for which I shall ever feel most grateful.

That you may get well over your present troubles, and that prosperity and happiness may attend you, is the fervent wish of

Your sincere friend,

Peter Le Mesurier,
Capt. H. P. 109th Regiment.

Woolwich, July 17, 1830.

My dear Sir,

From the truly kind and gratifying interest evinced by you towards my daughter, from the first day of my consulting you, I feel pleasure in sending you a statement of her case at the time of my placing her under your care, with a brief account of the *wonderful progress* her diseased limb has made towards recovery under your skilful treatment.

With unfeigned sentiments of gratitude and esteem,
I am, with sincerity, my dear Sir,
Your obliged

Frederick Campbell,
Lieut.-Colonel, R.A.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Case.

Woolwich, July 17, 1830.

Miss Jane Campbell is supposed to have lost the use of her limb gradually, from a slight accident about six years ago, as she walked home after it. During that time, and afterwards, a judicious medical friend attended her, and applied leeches, blisters, &c. The disease not giving way to these remedies, he advised consulting Mr. Brodie, who gave it as his opinion that it was a *confirmed hip complaint*, desired a seton to be placed in the hip joint, and the child to be confined entirely to a hard pallet. The seton was kept open *nine* months, during which time she suffered much pain; and a gradual dislocation of the hip joint took place, and violent inflammation of the knee, which was kept under by leeches, blisters, and cold applications. At the commencement of the *third* year, a large abscess formed close to the spot where the

seton had been inserted. She was again taken to Mr. Brodie, who advised its being lanced, and stated that a dislocation of the hip *had taken place,* and that he thought it was forming a socket for itself. She was the same day taken to Mr. Vance, whose opinion was in accordance with Mr. Brodie's, "that the abscess "should be lanced, and that dislocation had taken "place;" and he gave reason to suppose that the hip bone was becoming carious. Notwithstanding the copious discharge of that abscess, and others which had opened, the limb continued much inflamed, and the hip and knee became much enlarged.

For the last two years abscesses have formed in different parts of the thigh, and remained opened and discharging. The limb has been less painful, so as to admit of the use of crutches. It gradually shortened *five* or *six* inches; the *hip considerably enlarged; the knee swelled, contracted, and very much turned in; the foot swelled, shortened, and turned in; the heel drawn up; the whole limb stiff, contracted, and unhealthy in appearance; inflammation surrounding the several abscesses, all of them deep-seated, and discharging offensive matter.* The above was the state of the limb when the child was taken to town on the 25th of January, 1830, and placed under Mr. Long.

In the course of the months of February and March, under Mr. Long's treatment, the hip was *much reduced* in size; the knee-swelling reduced, and restored to nearly its natural size, shape, and position; the heel bearing to be pressed down; the discharge diminished, and was no longer offensive; the limb lengthened, and assumed a much more healthy and natural appearance. Up to the period of her leaving town in May, the gene-

ral improvement of the limb was *rapid, progressive,* and with *truth* and *justice* to Mr. Long, may be said to be *surprising*; the dislocation of the hip was reduced, it having resumed its natural socket (admitting the knee, in sitting, to be crossed over the other), the *hip, knee,* and *ankle,* all restored to their natural *size, shape,* and *appearance.*

The limb became much improved in strength, flexibility, and appearance, lengthened four or five inches, so as to admit the heel feeling the ground when standing; the abscesses healed gradually; and now, in the present July, the limb continues healthy, improving in strength and firmness; the foot is made use of in walking, being firmly on the ground at each step taken; one crutch has been laid aside, and a short stick substituted; the general health greatly improved.

F. Campbell.

Woolwich, January, 1833.

I have much pleasure in adding my testimony to the properties of one of Mr. Long's remedies, and I am well able to give an opinion upon this important point, because the lotion was intrusted to my care, whilst Mr. Long was prevented by the proceedings against him from continuing his personal attendance upon my child. During this period, the remedy was used by my daughter's female attendant, and I can testify that it *produces* a discharge where disease is *present,* and that it takes no effect whatever upon a healthy part of the body, but merely produces a refreshing sensation. It is obvious that no deceit could have been practised in this case, because the remedy was under my own control,

and was applied at various times, and always attended with similar results. Other members of my family have been under Mr. Long's care, and they *all* corroborate the statement I now make respecting the extraordinary properties of the remedy.

FREDERICK CAMPBELL,
Lieut.-Colonel, Royal Artillery.

52, Mount Street, Grosvenor Square,
June 18, 1829.

MY LORD,

At Your Lordship's desire, I give the statement of my case, and express my sincere thanks to Mr. Long for the cure and recovery of my health, under Mr. Long's care, by the means of his remedies; and I can positively and confidently assert, that of all the treatment I have hitherto undergone with other doctors, this is the only one from which I experienced true benefit, and feel perfectly recovered from a long and painful illness under which I have laboured, with abscess on the liver, and continual expectoration, in a languishing state of health, accompanied with restless nights, and pains in my left side. What I have stated is but an imperfect account of what I suffered, and from which his remedies have entirely freed me. I therefore, as a testimony of my gratitude towards him, return him my best thanks, and remain,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient, humble Servant,

D. GALLONI,
of Corfu.

To Viscount Ingestre.

37, Queen Square, June 16, 1828.

My dear Sir,

When I consider the state of debility under which I laboured when I placed myself under your care, five weeks ago, and the circumstance of my being now able to walk three or four miles, I cannot, in justice to my own feelings, quit England without returning you my sincere thanks. And with best wishes for your future success in a system that promises to be productive of such general benefit, believe me,

My dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Ellen Costin.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Meeting Street, Ramsgate,
August 2, 1830.

My dear Sir,

Were I to withhold my grateful acknowledgement of the great benefit I have derived from your discovery, I should deem myself unworthy the blessing of health which Providence has bestowed on me. I have the pleasure of stating to you, that I still continue quite well, and daily getting stronger. Even during the last severe winter I felt no return of my complaint, and a few days ago I walked the distance of ten miles without any inconvenience.

My friends join with me in best regards, and

Believe me, dear Sir,

Your truly obliged,

Harriett Page.

From the Marchioness of Ormonde.

14, Weymouth Street, July 18, 1830.

DEAR SIR,

I am happy to give you my testimony to the beneficial effects of your remedies upon some of my family; I conceive it a duty I owe to you, as well as to those who may be in search of the blessings of health. I am induced to do this from the numerous inquiries made to me as to your system, which I had a fair opportunity of studying, having been in daily attendance at your house for three months with my daughter, on account of severe headaches, which medicine had failed to remove, but which, I am happy to say, have yielded to your remedies. I have also witnessed the wonderful effects of your system upon all the cases I have seen under your care, and am perfectly convinced that your remedies cannot hurt even an infant.

Believe me, dear Sir,

Your much obliged,

G. L. ORMONDE.

From Lady Ashworth.

Hall Place, St. John's Wood,
September 16, 1830.

MY DEAR SIR,

Although I have written to acknowledge my thanks for the two complete cures you performed on me, viz. the ulcerated sore throat, and the attack of cholera morbus, I must delay no longer expressing how much I feel obliged to you for the perfect state of health

which I now enjoy, after having suffered so long from my late tormenting complaint.

The facts are briefly these. For nearly seven years I was so perpetually subject to rheumatism in my head, and most excruciating pain in my face and teeth, that I scarcely ever had two days of ease. For this, I had constant medical advice, without deriving any benefit. In vain I tried leeches, fomentations, and steaming my face, besides a variety of medicines. Nothing afforded me relief, except being stupified with laudanum. Latterly, I could not get into my carriage at night without suffering for it many days afterwards. Numbers of my friends can witness how much I endured; amongst others, those physicians who were long attending in my family, though they did not prescribe for my complaint.

I am now so completely recovered, that I walk in my garden in any weather, and at the latest hour in the evening, when the dew is falling, without the least inconvenience, although I never put anything on my head. It is now full three months since I have had the slightest return of pain, and all this has been brought about simply by inhaling; for, as you are aware, I never used the external application, or any sort of medicine. I confess, when you first told me inhaling would be sufficient, I scarcely believed it possible; however, a very few weeks convinced me you were right.

I am most anxious this should be made known, since there are such innumerable sufferers from pains in the head and face, which several people have now proved may be permanently cured with such perfect

ease and safety, and the health improving so much at the same time.

The children and I have now been under your care for all our various indispositions, sufficiently long to give your remedies a very fair trial, and they have never failed in curing us completely. My opinion is, that where people are so prejudiced against this innovation on the old system, it is because they know nothing at all of the matter, or what the mode of treatment is; if they did, they must think differently.

I am your much obliged,

M. Ashworth.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Bensham Lodge, Surrey,
July 26, 1830.

Dear Sir,

On hearing that some of your patients have written to testify their sense of benefit received from your cures, I now send you a few lines, in gratitude for the speedy relief afforded by your system to a very bad sore throat, with which I was seized last winter, quinsy being then a very prevalent complaint.

I had seen the danger and tediousness attending recovery from this evil in others, and after suffering much from pain and a feeling of suffocation during one night and part of the next morning, with total inability to swallow, from the size of the lump in my throat, your application, on being made for a minute or two on the outside of my neck, brought the inflammation to the surface of the skin, and broke the ulcer within, which

of course diminished the pain much, and enabled me by two o'clock to take luncheon. I eat with some pain still. In the evening you were so kind as to call and make a similar application, which lessened perceptibly the difficulty of swallowing. Next morning, most certainly, not the slightest pain, or even appearance of internal or external inflammation, remained.

I ought also to remind you of another occasion on which your cure proved even more instantaneously beneficial, viz., when my baby of eight months old was suffering from high fever and uneasiness attendant on teething, accompanied by cold in the head and great heavings. This attack had lasted two days, and was very severe. When you applied your application to his head, face, and chest, a faint irritation appeared for a moment on the skin. This seemed to exhale away. In not more than five minutes, the flushing of his face, the fever in his head and chest, were perfectly gone, his skin had resumed the pleasant cool usual to a very healthy infant, and his spirits became so high, that I feared his being quite off his rest that night; but, on the contrary, he went to sleep in ten minutes, and slept soundly; indeed, since that time, he has not had an attack again.

If these few lines can be of any use to you, it will give me much pleasure that you accept them as some mark of the estimation your services are held in by,

Your obliged,

H. Macdonald.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Great George Street, Westminster,
August 6, 1830.

Dear Sir,

In compliance with your request, I have pleasure in stating that I have derived benefit from your treatment of a spasmodic affection of my throat, to which I have been subject for many years at intervals. It had been very troublesome during last autumn and winter, and I had tried, without success, remedies which had formerly relieved me. I put myself under your directions about the middle of last February, and felt gradually relieved; and when I went out of town for a short time in the middle of April, I was enabled to walk up steep hills, and to use violent exercise, without bringing on the spasm, which I could not have done for many months before. I have never since had any recurrence of the complaint. Whether you have permanently removed it or not, I cannot yet say, for I have at other times been as well as I am now. It will require some time to assure me that the *cause* of my complaint is removed.

This you considered (as other persons whom I have consulted have done,) to be a local inflammation in the throat. The application you made to the exterior surface of it did for some time produce a discharge through the skin; but, unlike an ordinary blister, when the inflammatory matter was apparently abstracted, the very same application continued, had the effect of healing the skin.

This effect I have seen in other cases. I have also seen its extraordinary power of extracting and subduing recent and violent inflammation of the throat, arising from sudden colds. During the time I was

under your care, I took no internal medicine, and yet my digestion was better than usual, and my general health improved.

I think I am bound to state, that of many persons I have seen under your care, I never saw one who was the worse for what you prescribed. It will give me much pleasure if I shall be enabled, after a full trial, to say to you that I consider myself permanently relieved.

I am, dear Sir, your obedient Servant,

JOHN SPOTTESWOODE,
of Spotteswoode House, Lauder, N.B.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

From the Marchioness of Ormond.

Kilkenny, January 8, 1831.

DEAR SIR,

As I was obliged to leave England before your trial came on, and shall not have it in my power to return in time to attend it, I write that you may rest assured that my absence does not proceed from any change of opinion in regard to your system and most valuable discovery, which I hope will in time be fairly appreciated. I am happy to say my daughter has never had the slightest return of her headaches, and I never saw her in such good health as she has been since you saw her, for which I feel most thankful, and am very sorry I am not able to state in person how much I feel indebted to you for your care and attention to her.

Believe me, dear Sir,
Your sincere friend, and much obliged,

G. L. ORMONDE.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

Elm Grove, Roehampton,
January 1, 1834.

I have had many opportunities of seeing the extraordinary effects of Mr. Long's system in extracting disease from the body; and my own conviction that his lotion will take effect on diseased parts only, arises from my personal experience in a case of extreme indigestion, which occasioned a constant and distressing sickness, and for which medicine afforded me no relief. When I placed myself under Mr. Long's system, I had been a sufferer from indigestion for six years, and had consulted several eminent medical gentlemen during that time, without deriving the slightest benefit from their prescriptions. On consulting Mr. Long, his lotion was applied to my stomach: a discharge of humour immediately took place, which removed my distressing symptoms in a very few weeks, and I am now restored to perfect health. I applied the lotion to healthy parts of my body, but no discharge was produced by the application. I make this remark to prove the reason for my conviction that Mr. Long's system will take effect upon disease alone, and that his lotion is perfectly safe in its application.

C. Oughton.

Clapham Common, Dec. 30, 1833.

My dear Sir,

I have much pleasure in offering you my grateful acknowledgements for the great benefit I have derived from your system, feeling that I owe to it the happy state of health I now enjoy.

I attribute my late illness to a cold taken after the

scarlet fever. The earlier symptoms were a weak and disordered stomach, for which I had the best medical advice, without deriving more than temporary relief. After some time my complaint assumed a more serious character, the pain extending from the lower part of the spine, round the right hip, and down the sciatic nerve, with occasional numbness in the right thigh and leg, attended by acute pains in the knee and ankle. I was obliged to lie in an horizontal position, and was unable to sit up, except for a short time, or walk without the assistance of crutches. From the beginning of January, 1831, to October, 1832, I consulted some of the most eminent gentlemen of the faculty in London, and submitted to their various proposed remedies without any mitigation of my sufferings. I was at length induced, by the earnest recommendation of some most respectable friends, whose nephew you had cured after his case had been deemed hopeless, to place myself under your care. Your lotion took effect only on the inflamed parts: the discharges from the sores produced by it were very copious, and altogether different from those caused by the counter-irritants I had previously tried. When the inflammation was removed, the sores, which were never deeper than the scarf-skin, healed under the same process of rubbing which had made them. The application of the lotion never failed to give me relief; and I invariably found myself benefited by your inhaling system. In four months I walked without crutches; and after I had attended you six months daily, and three months occasionally, the lotion almost ceased to take effect upon me. I still continue to regain my strength, and I am most happy to offer this

additional testimony to the efficacy of your practice; and am,

My dear Sir,

Very truly yours,

HENRY RAVENHILL.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

4, Fig-tree Court, Temple,
December 26, 1833.

MY DEAR SIR,

You ask me to state what I observed as to your practice during the time I was your patient. Perhaps it may not be uninteresting to you to know the motives which led me to place myself under your care.

I do not recollect that I ever heard your name before the unfortunate event of Miss Cashin's death. Upon reading your trial in the newspapers, I was perfectly satisfied, as I think every other impartial lawyer must be, that you were in that instance improperly convicted. About this time, as far as I can recollect, our mutual friend Hodges mentioned, in conversation, your theory of disease and mode of treatment; but having, in furtherance of my study of the criminal law, given some attention to medicine and surgery, I considered that your system was only a revival of the old exploded doctrine of humoral pathology, and your medicine nothing but some very powerful caustic or counter-irritant. With these views, although my curiosity was in some degree excited, in consequence of your acknowledged success in so many instances, I could not help considering your practice an extension of the counter-irritant system, and therefore its application in every variety of case alike

a mere imposition. Then came your trial relative to Mrs. Lloyd's case, which from curiosity I attended: it terminated in a verdict with which I was perfectly satisfied.

From the evidence given by your patients, I felt that there was something in your practice which, though of the nature of counter-irritation, I could not understand, because I knew there was nothing in the pharmacopœia the known effects of which would produce such results as the witnesses deposed to. There the matter rested until Mr. Hodges, who was then beginning to find the beneficial effects of your treatment of his case, offered to take me up to your house, to be present at one of your operations upon him. I accordingly went, and you may perhaps recollect his introducing me to you.

Upon that occasion I learnt from you that your system was not founded, as I had supposed, upon the principle of *counter-irritation,* but upon AFFINITY or ATTRACTION, your medicine acting upon a morbific fluid which to a greater or less extent pervaded the human frame when in an unhealthy state, manifesting its presence in the different symptoms of the various classes of disease, according as its presence was greater or less in the different parts affected.

By the permission of the patients then present at your house, I was enabled to scrutinize the application of your remedy to their persons. There was one case of precisely the same nature as our friend's. Another gentleman was then under treatment for an asthma of a very long standing: he assured me that he felt so much relief from your medicine as to be quite confident of being ultimately freed from it, although pronounced

incurable by the faculty. I noticed a singularity in his case which I shall mention presently. Whilst I was engaged in making my observations, a gentleman came in who, from his manner of dragging his leg after him, and the helplessness of his hand and arm, was evidently suffering under either a paralytic or most severe rheumatic affection; most probably the latter, as he complained of being in excruciating pain, and of having laboured under it all the previous night. Upon his stripping, the same kind of yellowish humour which I saw flowing from all the other patients was made to come from him in three or four places; and, to my great surprise, the pain under which he was writhing immediately left him. There were several other patients the nature of whose various maladies was communicated to me at the time, but I have now forgotten them.

From my close observation of the treatment of these different cases upon that day, I was perfectly convinced that your application did not act by *counter-irritation*; and this opinion was confirmed by what I observed in the asthmatic case before alluded to, and also by what took place with regard to myself. In the case alluded to, when the gentleman's back was stripped, I saw a place rather high up on the loins, about the size of the top of a large teacup. The epidermis, or scarf-skin, was gone, so as to show the cutis vera in a high state of inflammatory action, with the yellowish fluid exuding through the pores; this being the general appearance of the sores of all the patients. Upon this part being gently rubbed, or I might almost say *washed*, over with your application, the flow of the thick yellowish matter was very greatly increased; but after continuing the

application some time, the supply of matter seemed in a great degree exhausted; and then your assistant, having placed a cabbage-leaf over the part, to keep up the discharge, proceeded to rub over a reddish spot upon the skin, of about the same size as that where the epidermis was abraded, which presented much such an appearance as would be produced upon the removal of a Burgundy pitch plaster applied for four-and-twenty hours. This spot was between the shoulders, and was perfectly independent of the place on the loins. Upon my inquiring what it was, I was told it was the remains of a similar place to that below. I then narrowly watched the application of the same sponge and liquid which had caused the discharge below, to this spot; and though it was repeatedly rubbed over with the same fluid in precisely the same way, I could not detect the smallest exudation of any fluid whatever from the skin; and this, I was informed by my friend Hodges, and some of the other patients, was the invariable result where the healing of the sore was caused by the abstraction of the latent morbific fluid from the part.

Then came my friend Hodges' turn. I carefully watched the application to him, and saw even a greater discharge of the same yellowish fluid than from the other patients. During this time you were standing by; and upon my expressing still some doubt as to the fact of the application not acting upon a healthy part, which had never before been touched by the fluid, if you recollect, you proposed to me to try its effect upon myself. This proposition startled me, and I must confess I did not like it; but at last, upon Hodges positively assuring me, upon his honour, that if there was nothing the matter with me it would have no more effect

than so much cream, I consented, well knowing that at that time nothing was the matter with me.

I sat down, with many doubts and fears about the result. You then applied the fluid, out of the same bottle that I had seen it taken for Hodges, all over my face and into my eyes, and afterwards I did it myself, with my own hand, in the presence of Hodges and several other patients. This application to my face was made more powerfully and for a longer continuance than some of the applications which were made to me after I placed myself under your care, and which I shall allude to presently; and from its producing precisely the same effect upon the natural secretions as was produced in Hodges, and as I afterwards experienced when under your hands as a patient, I am convinced that a fair trial had been made, and that it had penetrated through, or been absorbed by, the skin, and had acted on my blood.

The result of the experiment brought me irresistibly to this conclusion,—namely, That where there was an inflammatory action going on in the system, your discovery acted upon it, by attracting and getting out through the pores of the skin the matter which was caused by such inflammation, and which was lurking in the body; but that where there was no inflammation or inflammatory action of any kind, and consequently no matter, the application was as perfectly innocuous as so much cream.

The inhaling process, which all your patients underwent, some before the topical application and some after it, but which I did not then try, I concluded, from the similarity of the smell and of the vapour to that of the application, to be merely subsidiary to it for

the purpose of making the inflammatory matter more amenable, as it were, to the influence of the topical application.

I left your house upon that occasion firmly convinced that your discovery was a most powerful remedial agent in all cases where inflammation was either the cause or the immediate result of any disease, and that it was at the same time a most harmless medicine; and my subsequent observations during the time I was under treatment myself have fully confirmed my views.

It was this conviction which induced me to seek your aid when attacked, during the last spring circuit, with a very violent cold and inflammation, which settled in my ears, entirely depriving me of the hearing of one, and rendering the other almost useless; a matter of the most serious moment in my profession. On the day after my return to town, I went to your house; but not finding you at home, I wrote to Roehampton, to know what course I should adopt. Your answer pointed it out; and if I recollect right, the reasons why a topical application to the ears ought not to be made. I only saw you once during the whole time, and then you were exceedingly ill; but by following the plan you recommended, which was to inhale, and have the application made high up on the chest, I was entirely cured in about a fortnight or three weeks.

I perfectly well remember the sensation which the application caused, and the peculiar manner in which it affected me, differing from any which I had before experienced. The same yellowish matter which appeared in all the other cases came copiously through the pores of the cutis vera, and instantly the painful sensation began to subside; and after a little time, the

continued application of the medicine ceased, to my very great surprise, to occasion the pain which it at first excited, and only produced a similar sensation to the gentle scratching of a chilblain that itches. A similar result occurred every day that I submitted to the operation; and the only difference I observed was, that on one or two occasions a dark sanious fluid flowed with the yellow matter through the pores, which your assistant told me was very frequently the case where the inflammatory action was very great.

Nine or ten applications perfectly cured me of the deafness; and having drawn out of the system the latent morbific matter, which was the evident cause of the inflammation, the sore place healed up, and I have since been free from any return of the attack.

Whilst I was attending at your house, a case came under my notice which deserves mention, as it fully establishes the correctness of my views. I allude to Mr. R——. This gentleman, I understood, had been under medical treatment for a considerable time for some disorder of the spine. He had suffered severely from several artificial issues, and applications of a counter-irritant nature, without receiving relief, so that he at last was reduced to the necessity of being conveyed about on his back, in a kind of easy, recumbent carriage. When I first saw him he was able to walk slowly, and I have since seen him, and heard him say he was now recovered. The great singularity in his case was this, that your application was applied to the old issues, and brought out from them a purulent fluid, but a fluid of a palpably different character from that which had flowed from the issues: thus clearly showing a marked

difference between your system and that of counter-irritation.

Wishing you every success which your wonderful discovery merits,

Believe me, my dear Sir,
Your faithful and obliged servant,
EDWARD CR. LLOYD HALL.

John St. John Long, Esq.

To the Editor of the Morning Post.

8, North Street, Manchester Square.

SIR,

I consider it a duty I owe to the public, as well as to Mr. St. John Long, to beg a short space in your columns, in order to give publicity to the following facts. On Saturday evening last, at about six o'clock, I was suddenly seized with cholera, with violent spasms of the stomach and bowels, attended with vomiting and violent retchings, spasms also in a most painful degree of the lower extremities, cold clammy sweats, with pulse hardly perceptible at the wrists; these symptoms being further accompanied by a feeling as if the powers of life were entirely exhausted. At an early stage of the disorder I took a dose of rhubarb, but it failed to relieve me. In fact, the symptoms continued to increase in violence. My eyes were sunk in my head, my lips drawn and parched, and I became almost delirious. I made up my mind that I could not survive until morning.

In the mean time I sent for Mr. Long, who came to my assistance. This was about half-past ten o'clock.

He gave me a glass of mixture out of a pint bottle. The first glass lessened the great pain; the second was rejected by the stomach; but the third, being retained, had an almost instantaneous effect on the disease. The pain subsided entirely; and the whole time consumed in taking the mixture, which I did glass after glass, till the bottle was empty, did not amount to more than twenty minutes.

Having stated these facts, which I am ready to verify on oath, I think it my duty further to state, what indeed is my most solemn conviction, that had Mr. Long not administered his remedy, I could not have survived many hours. Next morning I was in my usual health, but weak from the exhaustion.

I am, Sir,

Your faithful and very obedient servant,

WILLIAM CONWAY.

25, City Terrace, City Road,
February 22, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

Although you have repeatedly assured me, since the first week of my being your patient, that my positive recovery was no longer doubtful, yet, upon several of such occasions, I have differed in opinion with you, in as much as I imagined the disease was so firmly rooted in my system, that a decided cure was at least improbable, not to say impossible; but now that my improved health and renovated constitution tell me that you were right, my obligation has increased in proportion to my previous unbelief.

I do not think that in a letter I could give so distinct

an account of my disease and treatment as I wish to do; therefore I have sent you my Case separately, and if it will be of any service to you, I assure you it will afford me great gratification, but will not in the slightest degree diminish the thankfulness I feel for my restoration.

My relatives, who advised me to submit to amputation when they saw how little the faculty could do for me, and how great my sufferings were, unite in gratitude to God, as the dispenser of all good, for my restoration, and in thanks to you, as the agent of his providence. For myself, there is no word, nor set of words, capable of expressing my feelings; and when I simply say "I thank you," you must receive it as comprehending (I wish I could express them) all the finest feelings of gratitude and respect that the human mind is capable of possessing; and while life is permitted me, and reason allows memory to retain its function, those feelings will always be entertained by,

Dear Sir, yours very truly,

JOHN DAY.

John St. John Long, Esq.

Case.

25, City Terrace.

For nearly the last two months of the year 1832, I suffered from an exceedingly bad cold; and early in January, 1833, I felt a trifling pain on the shin-bone of my left leg, which lasted only a few days, but shortly afterwards returned with a slight swelling of the part. I consulted my medical attendant, who pronounced it periosteal inflammation, and gave me mercury and advised cold applications; but in opposition to all the

remedies applied and taken, the swelling gradually increased, and the pain became so acute that I was nearly distracted. I was advised to change my medical man: I did, and engaged a gentleman of eminence in the profession, who ordered an outward application of mercury, and gave me strengthening medicines. Under this treatment the symptoms appeared to abate, but unfortunately I was attacked with the then prevailing complaint, 'Influenza,' which prevented a continuance of the remedies, and left me much worse than before. It was now nine weeks since the commencement of the acute pain, and I can confidently assert that in that time I did not have twelve hours' sleep, and the pain was so distressing that I could not rest longer than ten minutes in the same position.

My surgeon recommended me to consult Mr. Travers: I did so, and he ordered a blister to be applied on the swelling, and to be kept open; also mercury to be taken until my gums were affected, which is, in fact, salivation. By these means I was relieved from the pain, and felt much better altogether; but upon measuring round the *swollen* part of the leg, and comparing it with the other, it was evident the leg had wasted. I felt sufficiently well to attend my usual avocations, but in about a week or ten days the pains returned with increased violence. I again consulted Mr. Travers, who said that I ought to have had my mouth sore six weeks longer, and prescribed quinine. I was again blistered and salivated for nearly five weeks; but the effect was different; the disease now increased, and at night the pain was so excruciating that I raved with torture. When I next saw Mr. Travers, the sore produced by the blister was not sufficiently healed to al-

low him to touch the part; he therefore requested me to see him as soon as it was, and prescribed acetate de morphine to lull the pain. It had the effect while its action lasted; when that was ended the pain returned, increased instead of mitigated. I now had my leg incased with a plaster, and bandaged after the method practised by Dr. Scott, of Bromley; but getting gradually worse, and being so reduced that I could scarcely move off the bed, my surgeon accompanied me to Sir Astley Cooper, who immediately pronounced it a growth of the bone caused by the inflammation of the periosteum not having been reduced. He ordered me to keep my leg always in an elevated position, so that the blood might be thrown back from the affected part; to be again salivated, and three cuts to be made on the swelling; the knife in each instance to scratch the bone, and fresh cuts or stabs as often as the old ones healed up.

At my request, my surgeon endeavoured to prevent the necessity of the cutting, by applying leeches every night, and keeping my leg constantly bathed with cold lotion. This failed, and at last the incisions were made; but the large quantities of morphine I had taken, and was then taking, had so shattered my nerves, that the operation, trifling as it may appear, occasioned me such bodily illness that I could not submit to it again; therefore my surgeon directed me to put beans in the cuts already made, so as to keep them open, and convert them into issues. This, and keeping my leg elevated for about six weeks, prevented the disease going further, but did not diminish it; and when I again attempted to attend to business, fresh inflammation was produced, and I was soon as bad, if not worse, than before.

With the exception of the week or ten days after the first blister was applied by Mr. Travers's direction, I had now been for eleven months suffering the most dreadful agony: my constitution undermined; my spirits broken; without having one hour of natural sleep, and obtaining rest only by means of the morphine, from the dreadful effects of which I was fast going to the grave.

My friends now advised me to see Mr. St. John Long, who had cured more than one person, known to them, after the faculty had failed; but public report had prejudiced me against him. I went to him with great reluctance, being afraid to trust myself under the care of one who, from what I had heard and read, I was bound to consider ignorant and culpable, if not criminal. I saw him on the 21st of November, 1833; half an hour's conversation took away more than half the bad opinion I had formed. I went to him again on the 22nd, and was introduced into the practice-room, where there were several gentlemen patients, who soon convinced me that my previous opinion was founded in error. I now felt a confidence at least equal to my former timidity; and although he would not give me positive hopes of a cure, I became his patient on the 25th. Upon the first application of his remedy, so much dark-coloured fluid was extracted from the affected part that Mr. Long immediately said, as the lotion had taken the proper effect, he could now give me hopes of a speedy recovery, providing the mortification which had taken place round the issues did not retard me. Fortunately it did not; and from that day I have been gradually getting better, and my leg has entirely healed under the daily application of the lotion. I am so far

recovered that I have attended to my professional duties for the last month without experiencing any inconvenience from the disease, but am gaining health and strength daily.

My friends consider my recovery almost miraculous, for I believe it was the opinion of most, if not of all, the medical men who saw me, that amputation alone would stop the disease; and indeed one gentleman, who ranks high in the profession, who saw me several times as a friend, has always asserted that that only could save my life; but I was in so debilitated a condition when I went to Mr. Long, that I feel convinced I should have sunk under the operation.

With respect to the erroneous opinion I had formed of Mr. Long and his system, I must say that I now feel ashamed of it; yet I am not the only one who fell into such an error; there are thousands at this time under the same mistake; but I hope he will shortly be enabled to clear away the purposely excited prejudice against him, for until he can do so, his actions will be misconstrued, and a well-wove veil of calumny will conceal the merit due to his discovery from the great body of the public; and its benefits will be felt only by the discerning few whose ears are shut against Slander's venomed whisper, and can justly appreciate the cause that excites it.

JOHN DAY.

8, North-street, Manchester-square,
March 13, 1833.

Well-tried experience enables me to add my testimony to the foregoing statements, that Mr. Long's lo-

tion only takes effect on diseased parts, and has no effect whatever on those which are healthy, except that of refreshing. For the last fourteen years I have been a martyr to pain, and have partially lost the use of my limbs in consequence. I have had frequent attacks of inflammation on the brain, and my sufferings gradually increased. I had the advice of Drs. R——, B——, E——, Surgeon K——, &c., without deriving any permanent benefit, and the pain in my hip became so great that an instrument was passed into the hip-joint twenty-three times without its affording me any relief; on the contrary, I was made worse: but when Mr. Long's remedy extracted a quantity of matter, I found relief in three or four days, and eventually I became perfectly cured.

The following may prove interesting: Dr. A—— called upon me while I had the discharge in my hip, and declared with much liberality, that such a discharge was most likely to effect my cure and to improve my general health; that the discharge looked very healthy; that the skin was not broken, and had only a red appearance without inflammation where the matter was oozing out. He advised me to go on with the system, and said that it baffled his skill to comprehend, nor could he imagine, what preparation it could be that produced a sore and then healed it; that he could make sores, but knew of nothing that could produce the double effects. He also expressed the highest opinion of Mr. Long's lotion, and declared his conviction that it could do no harm.

William Conway.

March 20, 1833.

Should the following statement of an obstinate case of rheumatism be the means of inducing any invalid, similarly afflicted, to place himself under the care of Mr. St. John Long, and thus obtain a timely respite from his sufferings, the slight trouble of writing it will be fully repaid by the pleasing reflection that it has not been written in vain. About four years ago I was attacked by a violent rheumatic fever, and by which I was immediately deprived of the free use of my limbs. Since the period I have named, no expedient likely to be of service to me has been left untried. All that medical aid could do was done without success, excepting I may be permitted to quote the Latinism, "Non "progredi est regredi" in its full force. Nothing appeared either to increase or diminish the distressing symptoms of the complaint. During the last two years I frequently thought of placing myself under Mr. Long's care; while a fear of I knew not what, a vague idea that my constitution, hitherto unimpaired, might be seriously injured by the means employed to restore a free action to my limbs, thereby rendering the remedy worse than the disease, deterred me from carrying my wishes into execution. It must therefore be obvious that I paid this gentleman no compliment when, nearly five months ago, after having found every other expedient ineffectual, I at length became one of his patients. Since I first entered his house, I have had ample opportunity of observing and experiencing the application of "the lotion," and can positively assert that it may not only be used with safety, but that it will produce *no effect* where *no disease* exists. For the last two months it has been *daily* applied all over my frame, and though

vigorously applied it has produced no excoriation, no sore, no discharge whatever, nothing beyond an unusual redness on the parts of my limbs affected by the complaint. Of late a considerable reduction of the enlarged joints has taken place, and consequently an increased freedom in moving them is the result; while my bodily strength has been gradually renovated in a manner that leaves me to hope for a further improvement; to what extent time alone can decide. To say that I expect a perfect restoration would not be strictly true; still the tribute is due to Mr. Long's talents to state my thorough conviction of his ability to have effected it, had I applied to him at an earlier stage of the complaint. It has been justly observed by a modern writer, that "Scepticism and Ignorance may ask a question in three lines, which will cost ingenuity and learning thirty pages to answer; and when all is done, the same question shall be triumphantly repeated, as if nothing had been written on the subject." The correctness of this observation being undeniable, the friends of Mr. Long, more particularly those who have become so after having been his patients, can scarcely feel surprised at finding their assertions of the benefit they have derived from a judicious application of his remedies wholly disregarded, or at best merely listened to with a passive smile of incredulity. This incredulity is founded, no doubt, on the ignorance of the public in general, with respect to the plan so successfully adopted by Mr. Long in his novel mode of effecting a restoration to health by eradicating what, according to his theory, is the primary cause of all the various diseases the human frame is subject to; but, as it is reported to be totally unlike any other medical treatment, it has to contend against prejudices fostered by false notions and

strengthened by time. The attempt to overcome these prejudices must ever be a point of extreme delicacy, and will require the most unremitting exertions. To argue, therefore, for the merit or demerit of a new theory from the numbers who receive or reject it, is a fallacious mode of informing the judgment; and he can be very little acquainted with the usual course of the world who has not found, by his own experience, that as there are some men capable of believing the grossest absurdities, so there are others equally notorious for questioning the plainest facts: hence the ready assent which has been yielded to the improbable reports so industriously propagated by the united efforts of envy, calumny, and spite, at Mr. Long's expense, with a view of undermining his claim to public justice as a man of science—his reputation as a man of honour and respectability. Envy, calumny, and spite, however, have not effected this darling object to the desired extent. Mr. Long's house is still the resort of many an invalid who has sought relief elsewhere in vain, and its owner is still eminently successful in subduing many an obstinate case by the action of his remedies. That these remedies are composed of a something extraordinary and uncommon, the unceasing clamour raised, in order to decry them, affords of itself a convincing proof to every unprejudiced mind: had their *inefficacy* been *clearly* established, they would at once have ceased to attract attention. This latter idea *alone* induced me to place myself under the care of Mr. St. John Long.

My reference is at the service of Mr. Long and his friends, at all times, as subjoined.

HOLLAND COHAM.

Dunsland, near Oakhampton, Devon.

Bellevue House, Youghall,
August 14, 1830.

My dear Sir,

In the year 1823 I was overturned in a carriage, and my head came with some force against the side panel. As I felt no inconvenience, at the time, from the blow, I thought it unnecessary to be bled; but in about a week afterwards I was attacked with a pain across my forehead, and applied leeches to my temples and forehead, but found little or no benefit from them. The pain, however, after some months became less acute, and at times I was quite free from it; but in coughing, my head always received so violent a shock, that I felt as if it was opening. I tried sea-bathing, shower-baths, cephalic snuff, and many other things, but all without effect; and the attacks continued until I commenced with your valuable remedies in April last. I followed your directions regularly for two months, and I thank God they have effected a complete relief from pain, not having had a single attack since I saw you; and I am the more induced to hope that the relief will be permanent, as I have not now the least shock in my head when I cough. Under these circumstances, and a grateful feeling for your kind and successful operations, I have only to say that I have great pleasure in placing this letter at your disposal, to make any use of it you may deem desirable.

Believe me to be, my dear Sir,
Very faithfully yours,
M. C. J. Irvine.

John St. John Long, Esq.

In the ensuing case, as appears from the following extract, I could not give hopes of a radical cure, and therefore I did not feel justified in inducing so elderly and infirm a patient to undertake a fatiguing journey of two hundred miles, to place himself under my care.

Dunstable, April 16, 1830.

DEAR SIR,

Notwithstanding I have had no encouragement from you to undertake so long a journey, I have continued to travel about two hundred miles since Wednesday morning last, and hope to arrive in London before two o'clock tomorrow, and that you will allow me a conference with you at your own house.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours obediently,

THOMAS LLOYD.

John St. John Long, Esq.

The following are extracts from Colonel Lloyd's case, drawn up by himself.

First, I am seventy-four years of age, and for the last ten years I have been subject to winter cough, which has increased for the last four or five, so as to confine me to the house entirely: ankles have swelled, and upon pressure become indented. My physician gave me pills and laudanum, noon and morning, to procure sleep, to which I was almost a stranger, and for the stomach four grains of calomel and eight of Dover's powders. I cannot lie on either side, but sit bolstered up by five or six pillows. After a paroxysm of coughing, I sink on my left side.

My system being such as always to afford more or less relief, even in cases in which a radical cure is not to be expected, Colonel Lloyd found that the use of my remedies produced a great mitigation of the symptoms of his disorder, and I was anxious that he should have remained longer than his engagement in the country allowed of. The relief he experienced will appear from the following letter; and had Colonel Lloyd been enabled to continue some time longer under my care, I should have had no doubt of restoring him to the enjoyment of many years of greatly improved health.

8, Duke Street, Manchester Square,
June 9, 1830.

My dear Sir,

As I am obliged to leave London this day, and contrary to your desire that I should remain some further time under a system that has proved so beneficial to me, I can do no less than most cordially thank you for that great and surprising benefit that I have received in the short space of seven weeks. I was then suffering under a most severe cough, which obliged me every night to expectorate a phlegm and mucus which four or five handkerchiefs would hardly contain, and I seldom could procure above two hours' sleep. At present, thank God, I rarely cough half a dozen times in the night, and enjoy five or six hours' rest. If the cough should make its approaches when the winter comes on, I will again avail myself of your invaluable discovery: and

I am, dear Sir,
Your obliged humble servant,
Thomas Lloyd.

To John St. John Long, Esq.

It gives me the greatest pleasure to add my testimony to the foregoing statements in confirmation of the extraordinary and most beneficial effects of Mr. Long's system, to which, by the blessing of Providence, I OWE MY EXISTENCE. I cannot do better than transcribe parts of my evidence given at the inquest on the body of the late Miss Cashin. It is now almost three years since that evidence was given, and four years since I was a patient of Mr. Long's; and I may say, without the slightest exaggeration, that from that time up to the present moment no human being could possibly enjoy better health than I have done.

M. F. THOMPSON,
(late Miss Christian.)

Extract from Evidence taken on Oath before William Stirling, Esq., August 27, 1830.

Q. For what complaint did you attend Mr. Long? —*A.* It was considered consumption.

Had you been under the care of any other medical men for that complaint?—Yes.

Were they men of eminence in that art?—Certainly.

In what way did Mr. Long treat you? What did he do for you?—He treated me as his patient, according to his system.

Did he make any wound or sore on any part of you? —Several.

Whereabouts did he make those sores?—On my chest, on my left side, on my back, and on my temples.

Did you recover under his care?—Certainly.

Did you call in any other assistance or advice, or recover entirely under his care?—Entirely under his care.

And is that recovery not only to your own satisfac-

tion, but also to your friends', and all who knew you? —Most decidedly.

Did the sores you mention occasion the bringing away of any part of the surface of the outer skin?—Yes.

* * *

Did the medical gentlemen you mention say your case was consumption?—Yes.

They were of that opinion?—Yes, I understood so. They did not say it to me; it was said to my friends. I dare say one medical gentleman would say it here. When I went to see that medical gentleman, so much was I altered in my appearance and health, that when I entered the room he did not know me in the least. He said he could not believe it possible. He said it was A MOST DECIDED CURE (he told my friends) OF CONSUMPTION.

He told you he considered you were cured of consumption?—He told my friends so. I understood he expressed a wish to see me; and when I entered the room, I said, "How do you do, Sir?" He did not know me in the least, and brought a chair, and asked me to sit down; and I said, "I think, Sir, you must have forgotten me." When I mentioned to him my name, he said, "God bless me! I did not know you." He asked me whether all the symptoms I had when he attended me had left me, and I said "Yes;" and he said it was most wonderful. He said, "I never saw anybody appear in better health than you do now." When he attended me I was very ill indeed, and kept my bed.

Perhaps some time had elapsed in the interval: you had been in the country to receive the benefit of fresh air?—I have not been in the country since I left Mr. Long.

Did the sores affect your inside ?—Not in the least.

They were not, perhaps, very bad sores ?—They were sore.

Were you obliged to be confined to your bed ?—No. During the time I had the sores I went to Mr. Long. Before that I was not able to walk at all ; but during the time I had the sores, I was able to walk from my residence at North Bank to Harley-street, during the time the sores were on me.

Who was your medical man ?—Mr. Thomas, of Leicester-place : he attended my mother when she died.

I think you stated you had several medical gentlemen attending you ?—I had two during the time I was so ill. I had always been ill from a child.

* * *

How did you hear of Mr. Long ?—My friends saw it in the paper ; and knowing that I had been given up by the medical men, they took me to Mr. Long.

Do you know whether Mr. Long treats for any other disease except consumption ? — Several besides consumption.

Have you any objection to state the operation you underwent at Mr. Long's ?—I had the same operation performed as the deceased underwent.

Were there a great many patients under his care ? — A great many.

Were they all treated in the same way ?—Yes, they were.

Was the same thing applied when the sore was made ? —Yes.

Did it destroy the skin at the time ?—It takes the *surface* of the skin off : it makes it have a red appearance.

Now you have experienced it, would you have any hesitation in undergoing it again?—Not the slightest. I would cheerfully undergo the same thing to receive the same benefit.

Do you know of any person being cured who had a confirmed consumption?—It is impossible for me to say whether a person had a consumption, or not; but as another proof that mine was a consumption, I should state, that I have lost my mother in a consumption, and the medical attendants stated that it was a consumption; and I have lost my sister in a consumption, and my brother in a consumption. * * *

Did you expectorate freely before you went to Mr. Long's?—Not freely, because it pained me very much. It was not free.

Was there a considerable quantity?—I used to bring up a great deal in the morning: I was very much troubled with a cough.

Was there any appearance of blood?—I have seen blood about three times.

Did you perspire during the night?—Very much: only during the last illness.

Did you spit up hard lumps?—I certainly did. *When I used to expectorate into the water,* IT SUNK TO THE BOTTOM.

Do you think, if he had taken the sponge and applied it to any part which was not affected, that it would likewise have removed the skin?—No, quite the contrary: the same application where I had pain took away the skin; but where I did not feel any pain, it took no more effect than a drop of cold water.

Did the skin become of a dark brown colour?—No: the same application produced the sore, and took away

the inflammation, and removed the pain. As the inflammation went away, so the sore healed, although it was rubbed every day in the same way, by means of which the sore had been produced.

I understand, that as to some patients he finds out where the pain is?—Yes, he does.

Will you allow me to ask you whether the matter you spit into the basin sunk to the bottom, and there remained?—It sunk to the bottom.

Did you observe what became of it?—Those lumps I spoke of, which I expectorated, sunk to the bottom, and when the water was emptied away, they stuck to the bottom of the vessel.

Were you subject to fits and convulsions?—Very bad convulsions indeed.

Now you are well, would you go to Mr. Long's, and submit to the same means?—I would willingly undergo the same means, because they would take no effect on me, as I am well.

What was the occasion of your making the application when you were well?—To prove whether it would take any effect.

So that you had some doubt about it?—I had been informed of it, and I wished to prove whether the same application which produced the sore would not make the sore when I was well.

What induced you to go to Mr. Long to make the experiment?—I said I would go, to prove whether it was the case; whether the thing which had cured me, and produced a sore, would not take effect on me when I was well.

M. F. Thompson,
(late Miss Christian.)

Extract from the Evidence given at the Inquest of Miss Cashin, by R. Porter, *Esq., late Surgeon-General of Jamaica.*

Q. But, judging as well as you can by its effects, was it calculated to occasion death to any one?—*A.* Certainly not: it was perfectly innocent. I will give you my reason for saying it was perfectly innocent: he rubbed me, *not every day,* but now and then, and the sore would heal up. Whenever he rubbed that part, there would be more matter, and the sore was very much inclined to heal if he did not rub it. At last it healed quite, as you may see by my skin, and there is not a mark or scar upon it. My cheek was opened nearly ten weeks.

You were not a partner with Mr. Long, or received any of the emoluments?—No: I paid him every day.

Was the lotion or application made up separately for each patient, or was the same applied to them all?—It was out of the same bottle applied to them all. I have seen three or four saucers of it out of the same bottle, and carried into the same room; and out of thirty or forty patients that I have seen there usually, there was not one came discontented, but all seemed perfectly satisfied with what was done. Many of them went away cured, and some of them are being cured.

You stated in the first part of your evidence, that the mixture was perfectly innocent. Will you allow me to ask why you think so?—Because it cures the wound it made. By rubbing on the same stuff, it cures the wound which it made.

Extract from the Evidence of Mrs. General SHARPE, *given at the Inquest of Miss Cashin.*

Q. Your husband, we understand, is a General in His Majesty's service?—*A.* Yes.

Had you been attended by medical men of considerable professional eminence?—I had.

Did your health improve under the care of those medical gentlemen, or not?—No.

After being under their care for some time, did you apply to Mr. Long?—I did.

When about was it that you applied to Mr. Long?—Nearly three months ago.

What course did he pursue with you: did you inhale?—Yes.

Did he use anything to you externally?—Yes.

What was that?—An application he uses to all his patients.

Was it a liquid or a solid substance?—It was a liquid.

Whereabouts was that liquid applied?—To my chest and back.

Was there any discharge?—Yes.

Was there any removal of the skin; did it come off at all; or any wound?—No.

In the course of Mr. Long's application, did you become better or worse?—Considerably better.

When did you go to him last?—Yesterday morning.

When you went to Mr. Long's house, were there a great number of patients there besides yourself?—A great number: many that I knew.

Were they all treated in the same manner as you were?—Yes.

Did you ever see Miss Cashin there ?—Yes.

Was she treated exactly in the same manner as the other patients ?—I believe so.

There appeared no difference in the treatment of the one and the other ?—Not in the least.

General Sharpe. I am quite sure this young lady can tell you nothing more than I can, and she is very delicate ; therefore, perhaps, you will permit her to withdraw.

Had you restless nights and no sleep ?—Yes.

Extract from the Evidence of General SHARPE.

Q. The lady who has just sat down is your wife ?—*A.* She is.

Was she some months ago in an ill state of health ?—She has been, from an early period in the spring, in a very delicate state of health. At the earnest solicitation of her father, I called on Sir Anthony Carlisle, who prescribed for her. He gave me no opinion at the time ; but in the course of a few days, when I was making preparations towards her comfort, her father came to me, and informed me that Sir Anthony Carlisle thought the case so far gone, that he considered the case was hopeless, and he did not think I need put myself to any further expense ; which opinion was confirmed by Sir A. Carlisle when I met him accidentally, and I believe he recommended me to take her home to die. She had lost one sister and her mother with the same complaint, and Sir A. Carlisle knew of the fact that it was a family complaint. I believe she was never asleep, and you might have washed yourself in her linen, the

perspiration was so copious. After inhaling, the third day her cough was so much altered, and having been in low spirits myself, and she having lost all hope, we positively laughed at one another, thinking there was a miraculous cure.

Had she any expectoration?—She did not expectorate in a basin, because she would rather shut her eyes to her own disorder. My own and her wardrobe were not sufficient.

Extract from the Evidence of Reginald James Blewitt, *Esq.*,

who was examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

* * * *Q.* Was that debility of which you speak arising from the unattended wound, and the swelling of the glands?—*A.* Exactly so, and my digestion was also much impaired.

What course of treatment did Mr. Long use towards you?—In the first instance he made an application to my wound. At the time I went to him the wound was attended with great inflammation, and it showed symptoms of erysipelas, and was very painful for two hours; it then went away, and the wound, in the course of the following day, began to assume a better appearance.

What did Mr. Long apply; was it a sort of liquid, which he put on with a sponge?—Exactly so; I also inhaled at the same time. * * *

Did you go on for some time applying to Mr. Long?—Yes, I attended him every day for six months, and had the application every day.

Did you also inhale at the same time?—I did.

* * *

Did it appear to you that the same liquid was applied to all?—I am quite sure of it. * * *

What effect did that application produce to other parts, where there was no wound?—On my breast it produced a discharge; it was rather a trifling discharge. It remained open for a few days, and by continuing the application it healed of itself.

You say that you continued the application, and that it healed it?—Yes, the same that made it healed it. I then had it applied between my shoulders.

What effect did that produce?—It produced a very great discharge from those parts.

How long did that discharge continue?—A fortnight, perhaps.

By the use of these means did you become better or worse?—Better, considerably.

Perfectly reestablished?—Yes; I could eat and drink anything I liked, and the wound in my back also healed up by continuing the same application.

Was the wound in your leg healed, and your general state of health reestablished, by that which you had from Mr. Long?—My general state of health is completely reestablished, and the wound in my leg is healed. The wound covered a considerable space, (I can tell you the size of it,) and from time to time there were various openings made in the wound. I should think it comprised a space as large as this book altogether; as large as a duodecimo volume.

* * *

I understand that Sir Astley Cooper considered your case as one of the most desperate cases of the kind that he ever saw?—That I was told by another medical man who attended him in consultation.

(*By a Juror.*) I am desirous to ask you, whether your hearing was also improved by the application at Mr. Long's?—Undoubtedly.

(*By the Coroner.*) Did you ever apply any part of this lotion to other places than those you have mentioned?—In the first place, I had it rubbed all round my wound, and it seemed to mark out the boundaries of the wound; it seemed to define, with a sort of red mark, the precise boundaries of the wound, and it did not affect the parts around it that were sound. I should state, that I had had the wound ever since August 1828.

Did Mr. Long recommend free living?—He did. I ought to mention, that during the time my back was discharging in the way I have described, in the course of three weeks, in about that time, I increased nearly a stone in weight, while my back was discharging.

Do you think it was Mr. Long's mode of treatment that gave you an appetite?—Yes. Before I went to him I had hardly any appetite at all, and from that time my appetite began to improve, till at last I could eat and drink in the way I have described.

Have you seen anybody on whom it has produced the same effect as it has upon you?—Yes; I have never heard of any case in which it has failed to do good.

Extract from the Evidence of WILLIAM ABINGTON, *Esq.*,

who was then sworn, and examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

Q. Have you been for some time past afflicted with any disease?—*A.* Not within the last eighteen months;

before that I had been subject, from a boy of fourteen years of age, to affections in the throat and in the chest.

Have you in the course of that long time applied to several medical people for relief?—A great many.

What did they state or consider your ailment?—Generally speaking, it was an inflammation on the trachea. * * *

Was it not considered by some persons as consumption or decline?—I was always considered as tending towards consumption, because my mother died in a deep decline when I was five or six years of age; and my father also, when I was about fourteen, was seized with the same complaint, and was obliged to go to Lisbon for it. * * *

What mode of treatment did Mr. Long observe towards you?—I first inhaled; but will you allow me to state, before that, I was so subject to spasmodic affections of the chest and side, with the rheumatism in my back and arms, that I could not contend with the atmosphere in the months of December, January, and February; I was always as if I was put in a vice, from the racking pain; I could not walk one hundred yards at one time, without stopping two or three times.

* * *

What effect did you experience from inhaling?—From inhaling I found my constitution so renovated, that in about a fortnight after that I was enabled to walk, on a winter's morning, from Harley-street to Kentish Town, without any affection of the chest at all.

* * *

What effect did the application produce upon you?—For the first two or three days, when I tried myself,

I rubbed my chest for at least half an hour, and my head well, and round my neck and throat, and I could not bring out anything whatever by way of inflammation, when the third day I said, "It does not sig-"nify, Mr. Long, the disease does not rest there. I "have always felt a curious sensation in the nape of "my neck; and I am sure, if you would rub there, be-"tween my shoulders, you would produce something."

Then all you did upon the part sound was quite inoffensive and innocent?—Quite so. I said, "Then if "you will rub there, you will produce something." Mr. Long then said, "I will rub it." And he did rub me, and in about twenty minutes a number of pustules were produced full of humour; and as he went on rubbing *that* humour ran down. * * *

What was the result of all the applications on your constitution?—I am better now than I have been for the last twelve years for a continuance.

East India House.

MR. BRAITHWAITE

was then sworn, and examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

Q. You live in the New Road?—*A.* Yes.

And are an engineer?—I am.

Were you, in your earlier days, afflicted with any grievous malady?—I was.

What was it?—A bronchial affection.

What effect had that produced upon your person?—A general debility and a violent cough.

Any shrinking or diminution in any of your limbs?

—A general wasting of the limbs, and spitting of blood.

For what period had you been afflicted with this before you applied to Mr. Long?—For some years.

During that time, had you recourse to medical men of great eminence?—Frequently.

Had they relieved you?—Not at all.

Had they declared your case to be without hope, —any of them?—They had.

When did you apply to Mr. Long?—Very nearly three years ago.

Then about the year 1827 or 1828?—The 5th of December, 1827.

How long did he operate on you?—Fifty days.

Consecutive days, or at intervals?—Fifty consecutive days.

Did he apply his lotion?—I applied it myself: he gave it to me to apply out of a bottle.

He gave you his lotion?—Yes.

Which you applied?—Yes.

Did it produce any excoriation?—After the second day.

What was the final event?—A perfect cure.

* * *

(*By Mr. Wakley.*) Before you applied to Mr. Long, were you not under the care of an eminent practitioner who resides near Manchester-square?—I was.

What did that medical gentleman state to you with regard to your complaint before you applied to Mr. Long?—He stated to my brother that it was a hopeless case, and that I must die.

Extract from the Evidence of the Marchioness of ORMONDE,

who was sworn, and examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

Q. What is your Christian name?—*A.* Grace Louisa.

Have you been a patient of Mr. Long's?—I have not myself, but Lady Harriett Butler, and two of my other daughters, have been.

Lady Harriett Butler, under your inspection, attended Mr. Long?—Yes, every day, for nearly four months.

From what time?—She has been there every day for nearly four months; and two other of my children have been to Mr. Long as patients. My eldest daughter, lady Harriett Butler, has been there from that time; the others had local disorders, which were soon removed.

What was Lady Harriett's disorder?—Very violent headaches.

Can you tell me what it proceeded from, or anything else?—I cannot say. I had tried a great many remedies, recommended by other physicians, without effect; but Mr. Long has cured her.

Was Lady Harriett rubbed?—Yes, every day.

Whereabouts?—On each side of her head, on the back, each temple, and on the top of her head also.

Did that produce sores or excoriation?—Yes.

On the head and on the back?—Yes.

Was your ladyship acquainted with Mrs. Cashin and her daughter Catherine?—Yes.

Did you see Lady Harriett Butler rubbed?—Always, and many of them (*the patients*).

Was the stuff they were all rubbed with the same? —I believe my daughter was rubbed with the liquid from the very same bottle on that day.

May I ask you, what is your reason for believing that Lady Harriett Butler and Miss C. Cashin were rubbed with the same preparation?—It is all delivered out of the same bottle that stands before us all.

Was your ladyship present when Miss C. Cashin had received the mixture to be rubbed?—We were all in the same room when it was delivered out.

And all that was distributed was given out of one bottle?—Yes.

Did you ever hear Mrs. Cashin or Miss Cashin complain of the treatment she was receiving from Mr. Long?—Never.

(*By a Juror.*) Does your ladyship know whether Mr. Long cautioned Miss Cashin, that if she did not attend him again it would mortify?—I do not think that he did, because I never knew of an instance of such a thing. It could not hurt an infant.

Had you any caution to that effect?—No; I washed my hands in it every day.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Will your ladyship allow me to ask one more question: whether, when the mixture was rubbed on Lady Harriett Butler, it produced any abrasion of the cuticle on that part affected, as well as upon that part not affected, or whether it was local and isolated?—It produced only a small sore upon the part affected, and it never produced a sore after the disease was removed, never.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Were you ever permitted to go behind the screen?—Yes, anybody might go.

And did you watch the mixture in its passing from one subject to another?—I have been behind the screen when there were twenty patients, and there could not be any change.

(*By a Juror.*) Knowing that Miss Cashin is dead, would you still have faith to allow your daughter to attend Mr. Long?—Yes. I hope she will attend tomorrow; and I certainly should send every child I had if they required his assistance.

(The witness then signed her deposition.)

Miss Smith

was then sworn, and examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

Q. What is your Christian name?—*A.* Penelope.

Where do you live?—At present at Richmond.

Do you know Mr. Long?—Yes.

From what period?—Ever since I was nine or ten years old.

Where was it that you first knew him?—In Doneraile in Ireland, in the county of Cork.

Was he very young when you first knew him?—Yes, a young boy.

Was he illiterate or well educated?—Very well educated indeed, always a very talented person.

Did he live in the same house with your brother and you?—Yes, he did, for nearly a year and a half.

Had he the reputation of being a good scholar?—Yes.

Were his manners and conduct those of a gentleman?—Perfectly so.

Do you know—had you any means of knowing whether, among other of his studies, he studied the subject of anatomy?—Yes, for a considerable time.

Was he also fond of painting?—Yes.

Have you known him continually, from the time of your first acquaintance till now, though he was away from his country?—He was away from his country a considerable length of time—for some years; but I have heard of him in England repeatedly in the intermediate time.

Since you have come to this country have you been under his care at all?—For nearly four months.

Have you recovered your health from his treatment?—I have derived more benefit from him than from any other medical man. * * *

Did you ever hear her (Miss Cashin) make any complaint of the treatment she was undergoing?—No, I did not, but I heard her sister-in-law say that she hoped she had brought her in time to be saved.

Who was her sister-in-law?—Miss O'Conner.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Will you allow me to ask you whether Miss Cashin appeared to you to be in good health at the time when you first saw her?—I should say she was a very delicate person indeed; extremely so.

Will you allow me to ask you whether, at the time you saw her, that you heard her cough?—No, I have not heard her cough; but I have seen her make use of her pocket handkerchief very often, putting it to her mouth frequently.

When you state that Mr. Long was fond of and studied anatomy, will you be kind enough to inform me at what period of his life it was that he followed that pursuit; I mean how late it was, about what time?—I cannot say exactly when it was.

Was it at Doneraile?—No, in Dublin, where he was pursuing his education.

Will you be kind enough to state how you happen to know that Mr. Long was studying anatomy about ten years ago in Dublin?—I heard it from various persons in the neighbourhood.

You heard it?—Yes.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Are you acquainted with the circumstance, whether Mr. Long has attended a regular course of anatomical lectures?—He certainly did.

Do you know that of your own knowledge?—I do know it.

(The witness then signed her deposition.)

M. G. Prendergast, *Esq.*,

was then sworn, and examined by Mr. Adolphus, as follows:—

Q. What is your Christian name?—*A.* Michael George Prendergast.

Where do you live?—I am residing at No. 2, Alpha Road, New Road.

I believe you are a Member of Parliament?—I am.

Do you know Mr. Long?—I do.

For what period have you known him?—Since the month of January last.

Have you been under his care at all?—I was under his care.

How long?—If it is the wish of the Court, I will state the circumstances, as the first application is similar to the case in question. I felt myself very much inconvenienced by a determination of the blood to my head, about the middle of January last: it was accompanied by the absence of perspiration, by the want of sleep, and by a total loss of appetite. I had never seen Mr. Long at the time I was in the state I have just described, but having received a favourable opinion of him from a friend of mine, Sir Colin Campbell, of his skill and powers of relieving all inflammatory diseases, I determined to call on him. He told me that his patients were so numerous at that time that it was impossible for him to afford me any assistance that day. I might say I described my complaint to him, and he told me he could afford me no assistance that day, for there were so many patients waiting. He promised to call on me that night at nine o'clock, and he did so. I am going to state that he first applied his medicine to my chest for a considerable time without any effect, I suppose at least for a quarter of an hour. I might say a more extended period of time; at least a quarter of an hour. He also rubbed my forehead with the same medicine or lotion, whatever you call it, without any effect. He then proposed applying his medicine to my back, which he did, and in less than three minutes he declared there was a copious discharge. I could not, of course, see the operation carrying on upon my back. He would not allow the servant to attend, but my wife held the candle and watched what he was doing; but he, not having

brought a sponge, my wife supplied him with one, and he applied the sponge supplied by my wife, (if she is to be examined she is here,) and a considerable discharge came from my back. He continued to rub it for five or six minutes. On the same occasion he first applied a cabbage-leaf, and he then applied a pad lined with cotton, and told me no doubt I should be disturbed in the night, from the quantity of matter which would exude from his application. I was so disturbed in the night, and was obliged to apply a fresh pad and fresh leaves. When I awoke there was a free perspiration on my skin, and my sleep was very unlike what it had been for a month before; it was very sound and comfortable.

Was there an excoriation upon your back?—There was an excoriation. The discharge continued the whole of that night, the next day, and the greater part of the third day. It discharged very freely, and I felt my head greatly relieved; and I have not had the slightest return of it from that day to the present.

Did you ever experience any ill effects from the application?—Not the least; but, on the contrary, great benefit, which has been permanent from that time to the present moment. It healed; the third day it began to heal.

Have you been at Mr. Long's house during his practice at any time?—Very often. There are people that I have recommended, and I have called on friends who were under his treatment.

Have you, from your observation, any reason to believe that he resorts to two modes of application, or only one?—Certainly I have no means of supposing that he has more modes than one, as I have always

heard his patients say it was always out of one large bottle. About five or six weeks after I had been relieved, I had an uneasiness in my chest, and inconvenience from cold. I applied to Mr. Long, and he applied his medicine to my chest, and in one or two applications, I believe two, completely relieved me; but that was five or six weeks after, and a complaint totally distinct and different from what I had before.

Have you, in consequence of the benefit you received from Mr. Long's application, put your son under his care also?—I have, merely for one application, which I shall describe. My son was afflicted with a very severe tooth-ache, and his face swelled very much, and looked very much inflamed. The face, up to the eyes, and above the eyes, his whole face was swelled, and his mother expressed great uneasiness.

Was he, in fact, relieved by what Mr. Long did?—He was. The lotion was rubbed over his face and eyes, and in one application the pain subsided, and the next day the swelling and the inflammation all vanished: there was no excoriation. A younger child of mine was attacked with an inflammation in the chest and throat, and she was taken at six years old to Mr. Long, who applied the same specific, as far as I was capable of judging, to her neck and throat, and completely relieved her in one application. It was what you call an ulcerated sore throat. By one application she was completely relieved.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Did any medical man call it an ulcerated sore throat?—No, I think not. I am not aware any other medical man was called in; but her mother is here, who would speak to it with greater certainty.

(*By Mr. Adolphus.*) In consequence of the experience of yourself and family, have you recommended many of your friends to go to Mr. Long?—A great many, and a great many have gone to him on my recommendation.

Have you been present during the whole of this inquiry?—I have.

Do you still persevere in recommending your friends to go to Mr. Long?—I do not know that I have had occasion to recommend any since this occurred; but I should place myself or any member of my family under his care, not only with as much confidence as before, but with infinitely greater confidence. I beg the indulgence of the Court to state the ground on which that increased confidence exists. I know of sixty honourable and respectable persons, who come to give their evidence with no other feeling, I am persuaded, than that which existed in my mind, of doing justice to an individual whom we all think an attempt has been made to persecute.

(*The Coroner.*) We only want your evidence as to the fact, not your opinion as to the motives with which other witnesses have come forward.

(*The Witness.*) I am asked this question, whether I have the same confidence? and I want to account for what I think a reasonable ground for entertaining the same confidence.

(*Mr. Adolphus.*) I told you at the moment you were going to give your reasons. I said I cannot ask for your reasons; and I have no right to ask for any reason. If anybody chooses to ask about them they may; but I shall not.

(*By Mr. Wakley.*) You say that your son and child

were relieved from inflammation in the eyes and throat from a single application of Mr. Long's specific; that by his lotion or specific they were relieved?—Yes, they were relieved: but upon reflection, I will not say to a certainty whether the little child had not two applications. That is capable of proof, because the mother of the child is here. The boy had but one: the boy, who is thirteen or fourteen years of age, and who is in the room at this moment, had but one.

Now, Sir, I ask you whether you were not aware that inflammation of the eyes and throat are frequently relieved and controlled by the application of a single common blister?—My experience does not go to the length of answering that question.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) I wish to ask the gentleman whether he has known cases in which persons have died under the care of Mr. Long?—Never, but this one of Miss Cashin. I never heard of any casualty of death under Mr. Long's treatment. I never saw any, and I never heard of any, but where the faculty had given over the person, and Mr. Long said they were desperate cases, and that he entertained little or no hope of affording them any relief.

(*By Mr. Wakley.*) When the lotion was applied, who requested the servants to withdraw?—Mr. Long. Mr. Long never imposed any obligation on me by oath, or anything of the kind, in his life; never.

You have never revealed?—I do not know that I may not. Mr. Long never asked me to sign any document, or imposed any obligation of secresy upon me.

(*By Mr. Adolphus.*) Had you any objection to the servant going out of the room?—Not in the least; my wife held the candle during the time of the application.

(*By Mr. Wakley.*) You say Mr. Long did not impose any obligation of secresy upon you: did you ever know anything to reveal?—No, I said to him that I thought his concealment, or attempted concealment, most ridiculous and absurd. I mean by that his taking any obligation from people not to expose the ingredients which he used. I thought that his asking obligations from persons to keep secresy a very absurd thing.

Then the servant was not in the room while the lotion was applied to your temple and chest?—No.

When Mr. Long commenced applying the lotion to your back, had he at that time the sponge in his hand?—I am sure he had, and the very sponge he applied to my chest; he brought none, and my wife got one for him.

You have admitted very fairly that you could not see what was passing behind your back; now I ask you whether, in your opinion, it was impossible for Mr. Long to change the bottle without Mrs. Prendergast seeing him?—In my opinion it was totally impossible. But she is here, and will give the evidence on the point; and I answer the question with more confidence, because Mr. Long had no coat on, and his arm was stripped up to his elbow.

I suppose he had a waistcoat on?—It was too large a bottle to be concealed in a waistcoat pocket.

(*By the Coroner.*) You saw no legerdemain?—No.

(*By Mr. Wakley.*) Have you seen the Chinese jugglers?—Yes, in their own country. It was in a very small room, and there was on the table a basin of warm water; and the sponge that he had was furnished by Mrs. Prendergast. He had no other sponge, nor could he have had without my knowing it. If you want any

more information upon it, there is a person here who saw the very thing.

Did you ever see Miss Cashin?—I never saw the deceased Miss Cashin.

(*By a Juror.*) Did Mr. Long use the same pressure on your forehead and on your chest as on your back?—I think a heavier hand on my chest than on my forehead. He worked a considerable time at my chest, and seemed a little disappointed that he did not find any acrid matter in my chest.

On the first application?—On the first application.

Did Mr. Long give you a caution, that if in case you did not attend to him again it would be attended with danger?—Not in the least. I should myself, if I felt the sensation which I complained of as I felt it sixteen or seventeen days before, I should instantly have applied to him. There was no occasion for it, because, from that hour to this, I have never had any symptom of it.

Do you know the contents?—I do not.

Were you never under any treatment before you applied to Mr. Long?—I had been in the habit of being attended by a person for whom I had a great regard,—Mr. Vyse, of Sackville-street,—and he recommended some poultices to me; but I had heard so much of this Mr. Long, that I had not only determined myself to apply to him, but I took very strong measures to recommend Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, the President of the Board of Trade, to apply to Mr. Long, and I wrote a dozen letters to him; and my opinion is, that if he had done so, he would have been able to preside at the Board of Trade at this moment.

Were you not shown a long list of names of persons

cured by Mr. Long?—I saw his book, and I have his book in my possession. A great number of persons have been cured by him, and a great number of those persons I have had conversation with; and I have ascertained from many, that the case published was a great deal short of the extent of benefit that they had received of Mr. Long.

We have been told that it was not customary for Mr. Long to go out?—I believe the two visits he paid to me were the only ones that he had made for some time; but I have heard since, that he has gone to persons who were in so debilitated a state that they could not attend upon him.

(*By Dr. Thompson.*) Will you allow me to ask whether Mr. Long ever told you that he never failed in any case?—Mr. Long told me, in general, that he succeeded; but that many cases had come to him so far gone that no human art could relieve them; but where there was sufficient muscle and strength in the subject, that he never despaired of relieving and curing.

(*By a Juror.*) Did he state to you his having seen Miss Cashin?—I never heard of Miss Cashin's name till I read of it; and I received a note from him, stating that a coroner's inquest was to be held on a subject in which he was very materially interested.

You have not the letter with you, I suppose?—No: it is not at all unlikely that it is on my table. I should think that a man upon his oath is to be credited for so frivolous a thing as the contents of that letter.

Did he give anything to his patients to drink?—There was a brown stuff which I saw him hand to some patients to drink, but I do not know what it was.

Was it wine, do you think?—No: I had the curiosity to taste it.

What taste had it?—It had the taste of ingredients from an apothecary's shop.

(*By the Coroner.*) I believe Mr. Long recommends his patients not to take any physic: I believe Mr. Long declares against all medicine except red port?—He always declares against medicine. The only recommendation he gave me after he had effected a sore on my back was, on my stating that I could not drink claret, which was a great punishment to me, he recommended me to drink a bottle of claret the next day, which I most religiously adhered to.

(*By a Juror.*) When you say you were disturbed at night, did it affect your bowels at all, or your inside? —Not at all in the course of that night.

I think you say that Mr. Long cured inflammation in your bowels?—No, I did not say any such thing.

(*Coroner's Clerk.*) Michael George Prendergast: you say, Sir, that you reside at No. 2, Alpha Road, Regent's Park; and you say that you are a Member of Parliament, and that you have known Mr. Long since the month of January last; that you were under his care. You felt yourself very much inconvenienced about the middle of January by a determination of blood to the head, which was accompanied by an absence of perspiration, loss of appetite, and want of sleep. You went to Mr. Long's at the recommendation of Sir Colin Campbell. You say he first applied his medicine to your chest at least a quarter of an hour: he also rubbed your forehead with the same medicine or lotion without any effect. He then applied the medicine to your back, and in less than three minutes there

was a copious discharge. A sponge was supplied for use on that occasion by your family. He continued to rub your back five or six minutes: cabbage-leaves and a pad were put over the part, and you were disturbed in the night by the discharge, as you were told by Mr. Long you would be. You awoke, after a very sound sleep, with a free perspiration on your skin. You say the application caused an excoriation. The discharge continued for two days, and you have had no return of the complaint from that time to this. You never experienced any ill effect whatever from the application. You have frequently been at Mr. Long's. You have no reason to suppose that he uses any other than one liquid for rubbing. You have seen him hand a brown liquid to some of his patients. Five or six weeks after, you felt an uneasiness at the chest, arising from a cold, and you were relieved by one or two applications of the liquid to your chest. You have put your son under Mr. Long's care, in consequence of his suffering under a severe tooth-ache. His face was much inflamed and swelled, and white stuff was applied, and by the next day all the pain and inflammation vanished: there was no excoriation. He has completely relieved your daughter from an inflammation in the chest and throat, by one or two applications of the liquid. You have recommended many friends to go to Mr. Long, and many have gone. You would not hesitate to put yourself or any of your family, on any other occasion, under his care, or hesitate to recommend your friends, but you should do so with increased confidence. You do not know, of your knowledge, that an inflammation of the chest and throat is frequently cured by a common blister. Mr. Long requested the servant to withdraw

when you had the liquid applied. You never made any promise of secresy to Mr. Long, or were asked to sign a book. The servant was not in the room when the lotion was applied. When he first applied the liquid, he had a sponge in his hand. Your opinion is, that it was impossible for him to change the medicine without Mrs. Prendergast seeing him: she held the candle. You never saw Miss Cashin: you do not know her. The contents of the liquid did not affect your bowels in the night alluded to.

(The witness then signed his deposition.)

APPENDIX.

I.

"I AM HERE FOR A GENTLEMAN WHO CONSIDERS HIMSELF TO BE THE "OBJECT OF A CONSPIRACY, AND IN THE PROGRESS OF THAT CONSPIRACY "GROSSLY, BASELY AND FALSELY TRADUCED BY ALL MANNER OF WAYS "AND ALL MANNER OF MEANS."—*John Adolphus, Esq.* (From the Short-hand Writer's Notes of the Inquest on Miss Cashin.)

MANY of my readers will, I know, expect that I should, before I conclude, say something of the unfortunate cases of Miss Cashin and Mrs. Lloyd, which have had the effect of causing so great a prejudice against my system. They have been represented as the direct results of my practice, and have served, unhappily, to impress many with the notion that my mode of cure, although it may be advantageous in some instances, is yet in a high degree dangerous, and may in many instances prove fatal. As this impression is not only erroneous, but at decided variance with the facts in the cases alluded to, and as much pains have been taken by my enemies to misrepresent these facts, a plain statement of what really took place will, now that the force of prejudice has in some measure subsided, enable the candid reader to judge how far I am responsible for the melancholy fate of either or both those ladies.

About the month of June 1830, as nearly as I can

recollect, Mrs. and the Misses Cashin came to my house from Ireland, for the purpose of consulting me on the state of Miss Ellen Cashin, (the sister of the lady whose death forms the subject of this Appendix,) who was then in a very advanced stage of consumption, so much so, that the Dublin physicians had given her up; and upon examination I held out little or no hope of a cure, and only upon repeated and earnest solicitation consented to take her under my care. She continued under my hands about a month; but the disease had taken too strong a hold of her constitution for my remedies to save her, and she sunk under it shortly after.

About this time, Mrs. Cashin, by the advice of a young friend [1], and I believe relative of hers, who knew my opinion of Miss Catherine Cashin's state of health, placed her under my care, with a view to eradicate the seeds of consumption which were evidently, to me, in her constitution [2]. Her back was rubbed but once, which confirmed my previous opinion, by producing a copious discharge of the purulent matter described in the foregoing treatise; after which her attendance at my house became very irregular, in consequence of the increasing

---

[1] Miss O'Connor, who had been a patient of mine, and whose opinion of my discovery is stated in a letter dated 4th of August as follows:

"Dear Sir,

"Deeply indebted to your valuable discovery, that (under Provi-
"dence) has been the means of restoring to me the inestimable bless-
"ing of health, of which I have been deprived for the last four years,
"allow me to offer you my most grateful thanks, and to join my
"name very sincerely to the number of your truly obliged friends.

(Signed) "M. J. O'Connor."

[2] The correctness of my views in that respect appeared from the *post mortem* examination, which showed most decided adhesions and cicatrices, with a large quantity of purulent fluid in the lungs.

weakness of her sister. Some days afterwards I saw her back : it then presented the usual appearance, showing that everything was going on propitiously. About this time she was attacked with sickness and diarrhœa, which did not surprise me, as cholera was a prevalent malady at that time. She complained of great thirst, and pain in the stomach, which retained no food, and appeared rather swelled. The probable reason of these symptoms was afterwards indicated by one of the witnesses (Mrs. Roddis), namely, that the deceased was in the habit of eating quantities of raw plums[1] till within five days of her death, and grapes after the plums were discontinued, of which, unfortunately, I was not at that time made aware.

Now knowing that from whatever cause these symptoms (which were the first to be removed,) arose, they were produced by an inflammatory action going on in the regions affected, and that that inflammatory action was aggravated by the virulent fluid pervading the system, and would not abate until that fluid was removed, I wished to attract it away from the parts thus immediately affected by it, and get rid of it altogether out of the system by means of a second application to the back, and a consequent discharge, which, when once obtained in a large quantity, would instantly have taken away the distressing part of the symptoms, and, as the case advanced, would have relieved her from them altogether. With this view I advised a second application to the irritation on the back, and fortunate would it have been for the poor young lady if she had acquiesced ; but she strenuously objected to it until the sickness at the stomach had subsided. All, therefore, that

---

[1] Sievefuls were left at the house.

I could do was to administer half a wine-glass of port wine as a tonic, and also some rhubarb and magnesia.

At one of my visits, Mrs. Roddis (the landlady of the house where the Cashins lodged,) was present, and expressed her anxiety about Miss Cashin's back, which I was looking at; but the appearance it exhibited was precisely similar to that of all my other patients, and, though naturally inflamed, looked healthy and in a good state: there was then no mortification, no sloughing, no gangrene. I administered a little medicine for the sickness, but the stomach was not able to bear it, and threw it off before I left. At that visit I saw a poultice of bread and suet, which had been applied by Mrs. Roddis upon her own authority. I remonstrated against its application, to remove the consequences of which I was obliged to order a linseed-meal poultice, which was accordingly made use of. The last time I was there I was told Mr. Brodie had been called in a few hours before, and on the following day I heard that Miss Cashin had died in the morning.

Upon Mr. Brodie being called in, his particular attention was invited to the irritation on the back; and after his examination of it, he wrote a prescription, of which the following is an exact copy[1]:

"℞. Potass. Carbon. ʒij.
Spir. Myriot. ʒiij.
Aq. Menth. sativ. ℥iii ss.
Tr. Opii. mz.

"M. ft. mist. cujus capt. sextam partem sextis horis cum coch. ampl. succi limonis in effervescent.

"B. C. Brodie."

"For Miss Cath. Cashin."

[1] See the *Lancet* of the 15th November, 1830.

This was all that Mr. Brodie prescribed; and it clearly shows that at that time he had no notion of there being anything like *mortification, sloughing*, or *gangrene* in the case; because it is evident, that if there had then been the least semblance of anything of the kind, the above prescription would not have been the one, and the *only one*, made use of by a professional man of Mr. Brodie's reputation.

The result was, that early on the following morning Miss Cashin suddenly expired; and when Mr. Brodie called in the evening to see his patient a second time, he received the intelligence with marks of great surprise, and exclaimed, "A case of murder!"

Let us pause here, to investigate the meaning of this exclamation, and to see if we can find a clue to what was passing in the mind of the individual using it. By whom was "the murder"? The only persons who had anything to do with the deceased were Mr. Brodie, Mrs. Roddis, and myself. Mr. Brodie could not, of course, have meant to accuse either himself or the officious, meddling Mrs. Roddis: he must therefore (it follows as a matter of necessity,) have alluded to me.

I will not stop here to prove that I had not committed any kind of offence, either *morally* or *legally*, because that will clearly appear when I proceed to comment on the medical evidence hereafter; but I will now endeavour to investigate Mr. Brodie's motive for making the charge conveyed in this exclamation.

That motive must have been one of the two following, or perhaps a compound of both:

First, To screen some improper treatment or conduct of his own; or,

Secondly, To express his feelings at, and to fix an

odium, and, if he possibly could, a criminal responsibility, upon me.

No other interpretation can be put upon the charge. Which, then, will Mr. Brodie choose?

I do not think it will be the first, although his prescription, and the lapse of time between his visits, does not at all tally with the nature of the evidence he subsequently gave; but I will not press it on him unless he should desire it [1]. I therefore take it as admitted that the second was the reason by which he was actuated.

Now why did he want to fix odium and responsibility upon me? The reason must have been one of the following, namely:

First, From motives of a purely public nature;

Secondly, From a compound of both public and private motives; or,

Thirdly, From private or personal motives alone.

Was the *first* the reason? If it were, the charge of murder against me necessarily involved this proposition, namely, That the party making the charge knew *exactly what* I had done, under *what circumstances* I had done it, and *why* it had been done; that is to say, knew *what* my system was; knew also the precise *effects* of my re-

---

[1] In a letter of General Sharpe, which appeared in the *John Bull*, is the following passage upon this subject: "Then, Mr. Brodie, does "it not strike you as extraordinary the situation he is left in? I believe "the common law is manslaughter if a patient die through culpable "neglect only. Here Mr. Brodie takes a patient out of Long's "hands, requiring the more attention from him in exact ratio to her "previous mismanagement. He approves the prescription, goes "away, never comes near her again till she is dead, and then cries "out 'Murder.' This is very like 'Stop thief,' ascribed to the most "proficient in the pilfering line."

medy; and, knowing these things, was convinced that my system was erroneous, and that the effects of my remedy were detrimental and not beneficial, and therefore, instead of its being encouraged, it ought, for the sake of the public, to be discontinued.

It does not appear from the evidence, that Mr. Brodie knew anything of Miss Cashin until he was called in professionally; indeed, from the tenor of his testimony, one may fairly conclude that he never knew her, as he never had seen her until that period: he therefore could not have known her state when first under my care. Did he know what I had done? From his own testimony it is clear he did not; because he says, "It appeared "to me as if *some powerful stimulating liniment* had "been applied to the back. I should not think it right "to apply a stimulating liniment to the back of a *person* "*in perfect health*, to *produce* such a *sore*; nor do I think "that any of the stimulating liniments in ordinary use "would produce the *same* effects—the *same* extensive "mischief[1]." From this it is evident he had no distinct notion of what had been done; and from his saying, "It is the practice of some medical men to apply sti-"mulants to the chests of persons labouring under con-"sumption[2]," one may infer that he had in his mind the *counter-irritant* system, and that he was not aware of what mine was. It is manifest too, beyond a doubt, that he did not know the peculiar properties of my discovery.

It follows, then, that not knowing what the thing was, his conduct could not have been actuated *simply* by public motives, because public motives would have

---

[1] See Report of my trial, in No. 375 of the *Lancet*. [2] *Ibid.*

prompted an inquiry into the *nature* of my system, and the *properties* of my remedy, and not an attempt to smother it, without caring for its merits. But it may be said, "O, yes, but a man may make a mistake, and "fancy he knows the properties of a thing when he really "does not, and yet be actuated simply by a motive for "the public good, in endeavouring to put it down, al-"though he does not exactly know what it is." When I come to criticise Mr. Brodie's subsequent acts and words, it will be seen that this loop-hole, if he should think to avail himself of it, will not serve for his escape.

Secondly, Was Mr. Brodie's motive of the mixed character above alluded to?

To judge of the motives of any man's conduct is at all times most difficult, because men's views and thoughts, even under precisely the same circumstances, vary quite as much as their countenances, and it often happens that they will dissimulate to such a degree, that one particular motive is ostentatiously put forward, whilst the mainspring of action is either completely concealed, or so far hidden as to make the motive of action appear a compound. A man's true motive can only be got at by a close and severe scrutiny of his words and works; and even then he may be so great an adept in deceit as to throw dust in the eyes of the most scrutinizing observer. For the present, then, we will pass over the inquiry as to whether Mr. Brodie's motive for making the charge was a compound one, leaving the answer, if it should be considered material, to be inferred from the result of our *third* inquiry, namely,

Was the motive purely personal, or not?

To give an answer to this question, it is necessary first to look at the relative situation of the parties.

Mr. Brodie is a distinguished member of that profession which, of all others, is known to be the most bigoted to its own notions, and the most intolerant of all innovation; whilst I, on the other hand, was the author of a system the direct effect of which is to prove that the present professional theories of disease are all fallacious, and at the same time the discoverer of medicines which must have the effect of throwing into disuse nine tenths of the present pharmacopœia, and which, it was well known to the medical world, had effected cures in numerous cases which had been abandoned as hopeless by the licensed practitioners. Mr. Brodie was in considerable repute, in daily, perhaps hourly, communication with "the medical world," and no one will for a moment doubt that he was deeply imbued with its views and feelings. And here I would observe that there is no real distinction in a personal motive between one which is applicable to a party in his individual character, and one which is applicable to him as one of a professional body; that distinction only affects the manner in which the motive is likely to influence his conduct, leaving the motive equally personal in the one instance as in the other.

That Mr. Brodie was at that time fully imbued with the feelings which actuated the great body of medical men, there cannot be a doubt, because his subsequent conduct clearly shows it. Let us, then, examine what those feelings were. That they were not very friendly to me for promulgating a system so totally at variance with their own, and which has the effect of unsettling all the received doctrines of the faculty, and of drawing away their patients, and consequently their fees, may readily be conceived; but the precise nature of their

malignity did not transpire until it escaped the lips of Dr. Alexander Thomson, who, whilst dissecting the body of the unfortunate young lady, exclaimed, "*We* "have been a long time looking for one of Long's pa- "tients. *We* have got one now, and *we* will settle "him!" Can any one doubt that this "*we*" meant the faculty, and amongst them Mr. Brodie and the other names which I shall shortly mention?

Is it not fair, then, to infer that the exclamation of Dr. Thomson expressed the sentiments of Mr. Brodie, because, as we shall see by and by, the acts of Dr. Thomson are recognised and cooperated with by Mr. Brodie?

For what purpose had the faculty, for a long time, been looking for one of my patients? Not for the investigation and trial of a new system, and lately discovered remedial agent, because that would best have been done by accepting my challenge to prove its effects, under their inspection, upon patients of their own choosing. No, that would not do; for they wanted to "settle" me; they wanted to wrap me in the toils of the law, in order that I might be "settled" with a long imprisonment, or perhaps transportation! The evidence of such a design and of such an attempt does not rest here; but in order to develop the deep-laid scheme, and to show who were the promoters of it, I must take up the narrative in its proper order of time.

I will not notice the numerous anonymous letters which were sent to the neighbouring justices and the coroner immediately upon the decease of the poor young lady, nor the inflamed statements in the newspapers; because it is a very difficult matter to connect them satisfactorily with the faculty, whatever our moral convic-

tion may be upon the subject: suffice it to say, that on the Saturday following the decease of Miss Cashin, an inquest was held upon her, which was from time to time adjourned. At that inquest, Mr. Wakley, Dr. Alexander Thomson, Mr. Brodie, and a number of other medical men, whose names will appear in due course as my narrative proceeds, presented themselves as the prosecutors, conducting the inquiry, and doing everything in their power, by fair means and by foul, to procure that verdict which the jury afterwards gave, in direct opposition to the coroner's declared opinion.

Before I proceed to comment upon the medical testimony brought forward in order to procure that verdict, and also the subsequent verdict at the Old Bailey, I will here give the confession of one of the party of the part he took in it, as detailed in No. 375 of the *Lancet*, pp. 213 and 214.

"After the coroner's jury had returned their verdict of 'Manslaughter' against Long, we hoped and expected that there would have been no necessity for further interference on our part. Unhappily, we were deceived; for Mr. Sweetman declined to appear as prosecutor, or to incur any expense in the affair. Hence Mr. Capes the parish beadle was set down as prosecutor, and the names of the whole of Mr. Long's witnesses were inserted upon the back of the bill to be preferred before the Grand Jury[1]. This bill was to have been laid before the Grand Jury at

[1] All the witnesses examined at a coroner's inquest always have their names inscribed on the bill of indictment, if prosecuted by a public prosecutor, such as a constable or beadle, in order that the Grand Jury may be put in possession of the same evidence as that which induced the coroner's jury to find their verdict.

" the Sessions House, Clerkenwell, on Friday Septem-
" ber 17th, the eighth day of the contested election for
" coroner, when, from the bustle, confusion, and
" anxiety that prevailed, John Long entertained strong
" hopes, probably that the bill as then drawn up, with
" the names of the whole of his witnesses distinctly
" inscribed upon it, would be at once ignored. On
" stepping from the hustings into the Sessions House
" we were much surprised at seeing several of Mr.
" Long's 'noble' witnesses in attendance, and still
" more surprised at hearing that they were *all* in the
" neighbourhood comfortably lodged in apartments
" which had been procured for them by the beadle,
" whose name was set down as the *prosecutor*. Of
" course, we at once saw that a bill with such a list of
" names at the back of it could not be *safely* pre-
" ferred before the Grand Jury. Further, Mrs. Rod-
" dis, from indisposition, was not in attendance. *Un-
" der these circumstances, we felt little hesitation in ap-
" plying to the Court for a postponement until the next
" sessions.* But it was urged to us by a gentleman of
" considerable legal knowledge, in the presence of Dr.
" JAMES JOHNSON, Mr. KING, Mr. EVANS, Dr. HOGG,
" and *other medical gentlemen*, that there would be no
" use in delay; that one indictment was as good
" as another; that the Grand Jury would not find
" any bill; and that the charge could not be sustain-
" ed at the Old Bailey, *because it was* NOT *a case of*
" MANSLAUGHTER. *Acting, however, upon the opinion
" which we had all along entertained, and our views
" having been supported by the gentlemen just named,*
" we resolved, IF POSSIBLE, not to give such a culprit
" as John Long the benefit of an ignored bill. A brief

" reflexion on what we had observed at the Sessions
" House *convinced us that a new bill of indictment was*
" *necessary*; that the names which had been impro-
" perly inscribed should not be again inserted; and
" that the employment of Counsel would be indispen-
" sable. *Accordingly we applied to* Mr. Henson, of
" Bouverie Street, a gentleman quite unknown to us,
" but who, we were given to understand, was deeply
" conversant in the various proceedings of our criminal
" courts. The redrawn bill, when laid before the Grand
" Jury, was 'found,' after the examination of *only three*
" *or four witnesses*; and in despite of all the wise and
" learned predictions to the contrary, in despite of the
" profound legal knowledge of the attorney-coroner,
" in despite of the ravings of the gentlemanly and
" learned Adolphus, Long has been tried at the Old
" Bailey, and by another sensible, upright jury of his
" countrymen, he has been found guilty of manslaugh-
" ter. The public will not be a little surprised to learn
" that in conducting a prosecution of this important
" and singular nature, *the funds have been supplied ex-*
" *clusively by ourselves,* and that *we* stand *responsible*
" to Mr. Henson for whatever costs may yet remain
" unpaid."

If any further evidence were wanted, we have the letter of Mr. Henson, directed to "T. Wakley, Esq., " Bedford Square," published in the *Lancet* of the 11th December, 1830, an extract from which is as follows:—

"REX *v.* LONG.

9, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street,
December 7th, 1830.

"SIR,

"Understanding that you wish me to send you the particulars of the costs incurred in this prosecution, and the moneys allowed by the county, I beg to forward you the following memorandum:—

	£.	s.	d.
Entire amount of costs in the prosecution of Long	132	1	3
By cash allowed by the County of Middlesex for the witnesses, and received by the Treasurer on the 8th of November	42	11	6
Leaving the amount of costs incurred *by you as the Prosecutor*	89	9	9

of which 89*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.*, 55*l.* were received by me before the Petition was presented to the Treasury, leaving a balance still due *from you* of 34*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.*; in addition to which will be the costs of the Petition to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, which will amount to 5*l.* or 6*l.* more."

So much for Mr. Wakley being a prime mover in this combination against me! Now let us see what are the proofs of cooperation in the general design on the part of Dr. ALEXANDER THOMSON. We find him at the inquest with Mr. Wakley giving voluntary testimony, and acting as counsel in examining and cross-examining the different witnesses. We find him the most prominent party at the dissections, at which time he made use of the notable expression, "*We have been*

" *a long time looking for one of Long's patients; we have* " *got one now, and we will settle him.*"

The Inquest ended on Monday the 30th of August. On Tuesday an application was made on my behalf to Lord Tenterden for a writ of *certiorari* to the Coroner, to return the proceedings into the King's Bench. On Wednesday, notices of bail were served on the Coroner; at the residence of the deceased's mother; on Dr. Thomson and Mr. Wildgoose, (who had been bound over to give evidence by the Coroner); and on Mr. Wakley, the voluntary prosecutor, and, as he styled himself, " the " representative of the family of the deceased." On the following day, the like notice was served on John Capes, the parish beadle, who had been bound over by the Coroner to prosecute. Dr. Thomson was not satisfied with these proceedings, and on the following day applied to the magistrates at Bow Street, and below is the report of his application which appeared in the *Morning Post* of the 4th of September, 1830:

" *Dr. Alexander Thomson* waited on Mr. Halls, the " magistrate at Bow Street, yesterday morning, and " stated, that to his very great astonishment no proceed- " ings had been taken to carry into effect the verdict of " Manslaughter against Mr. St. John Long, which was " delivered by the jury. The Coroner had not as yet " issued any warrant for his apprehension, and he (Dr. " Thomson), as one of the *principal* witnesses in the " case, *felt it his duty* to make some inquiry into the " cause. *He* had called *several times* on the Coroner, " but had not been able to see him: he therefore ap- " plied to the magistrate to know if he would issue a " warrant against Mr. Long? Mr. Halls replied, that

" the magistrates had no power to issue a warrant with-
" out going through the whole of the evidence. He
" would recommend an application to the Coroner, to
" know why his warrant had not been issued, and if
" he refused to issue a warrant, then on application to
" the magistrates they would adopt whatever course
" they thought proper. *Dr. Alexander Thomson* said
" he would act upon the worthy magistrate's sugges-
" tion, and inform him of the result."

Dr. Thomson immediately proceeded, in company with the Foreman of the Jury (Mr. Walker), to the residence of the Coroner at Battersea; but that officer not being at home, the following letter was left for him:

" 26 Mary Street, Regent's Park.

" Sir,

" *The Jury* not having yet been informed of the
" warrant for the apprehension of Mr. St. John Long
" having been issued, *claim* from the Coroner the *im-*
" *mediate issue* of that warrant, and beg respectfully to
" request from the Coroner *the reasons of the delay*
" which has taken place.

" I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

(Signed) " BENJAMIN WALKER."

" To Thomas Stirling, Esq."

It so happened that at the same time that Dr. Thomson and his friend the juryman drove up to the Coroner's door, my solicitor's clerk arrived for the purpose of serving an amended notice of bail, and he informed Dr. Thomson that he had just left one for him (Dr. Thomson) at his residence. Dr. Thomson then said he was there for the purpose of inquiring why I was not in custody as I ought to have been, and might have

been on the very evening the verdict was returned, if due diligence had been used, as he stated he knew I dined at home on that day, and he could mention the name of every person who dined at my table. He added, that the Coroner had not done his duty, and that he (Dr. Thomson) would take care that his conduct should be inquired into and represented in the proper quarter. He also said, that it was his intention *to oppose my being admitted to bail.*

With this view Dr. Thomson attended at Lord Tenterden's house at Hendon, on Saturday the 4th of September, and stated to his Lordship his surprise at the Coroner's conduct in not having issued his warrant for my apprehension before the preceding evening, and that he (Dr. Thomson) had come there, not for the purpose of opposing the gentlemen offered as bail, but to contend that *I should not be bailed at all,* for that whilst I was at liberty the lives of His Majesty's subjects were endangered *by a continuance of my practice.* Lord Tenterden replied, that it was not necessary that I should be in actual custody before the time I was admitted to bail. He had read the depositions and saw nothing in them to prevent my giving bail, or indeed to justify my imprisonment: and then Dr. Thomson, in answer to a question from Lord Tenterden, said that he did not care about the sufficiency of the bail; who were thereupon immediately accepted.

This conduct of Dr. Thomson and of his friend the juryman is such, that I will not waste time in observing upon it.

Let us now see if there is any evidence of other parties joining in this scheme for imprisoning me.

On the eighth day after the death of the deceased,

a Dr. JAMES JOHNSON[1] volunteered his services as a witness, and in the *Lancet* appears the following letter:—

"Suffolk Place, Pall Mall East,
6th November, 1830.

"Dr. Johnson thinks the Profession ought to in-

---

[1] This is the gentleman alluded to in my letter published in the *John Bull* of the 12th October, 1828, of which the following is an extract.

"A Dr. JOHNSON, who has made himself very busy in endeavouring to assail my practice through evidence obtained from my patients, having been completely exposed in one instance by the *Literary Gazette*—the party concerned coming forward and directly contradicting him on every particular he had asserted—has thought he might make himself a little more notorious by imputing other cases of failure through the far-spread medium of the *John Bull*. These, I beg to say, like his former charges, are utterly destitute of foundation, and are thus answered—the written documents in proof thereof being offered for your own inspection and satisfaction.

"Dr. JOHNSON states that one of the persons mentioned in the *Literary Gazette*, where the lungs were tuberculated, had since become a patient of his, and that this person declares 'he never transmitted or submitted to the *Literary Gazette* any such document as that which is published there.' No document whatever having been published there, it is only by circumstances that I know the party to whom the Doctor alludes; and I beg you to insert the following extracts from his letters to me,—on which the editor of the *Literary Gazette*, not in advocating my cause, but in submitting my pretensions candidly to public scrutiny, had a right to rely.

"'Prompted no less from a sense of gratitude towards you than duty to the public, I am' (says the Rev. Mr. N——, the gentleman alluded to,) 'most anxious to testify my strong assurance of the wonderful efficacy of your method of treatment in consumptive cases. On the 12th of July I reached town from Hastings, and immediately placed myself under your care. My lungs were most decidedly in a tuberculated state; with the help of a stick I was scarcely able to struggle twenty yards; my perspirations were the most profuse ever heard of; my pulse always very quick; my bones plastered in several places to prevent their forcing through; my expectoration very copious, and often tinged with blood; and ever since I was first attacked with phthisis, which occurred in March last, my cough, till lately, had been of a most violent and

" demnify Mr. Wakley for the expenses of St. John
" Long's trial, and offers his mite of 5*l.* for that purpose."

' incessant nature. It is now rather more than six weeks since I ' first submitted to your treatment, and I am able to walk three or ' four miles at one time. My perspirations left me entirely a fort- ' night since; my pulse, cough, and expectoration are so much re- ' duced, that I feel assured, without the slightest risk of danger, I ' can return home into the country. This wonderful faculty which ' you possess, in at once communicating a healing power to the most ' diseased state of the lungs, must be acknowledged to be the most ' enlightened discovery of the present age,' &c. &c.

" It seems, however, that this ill-advised gentleman has since sought the aid of Dr. Johnson, who declares him to have 'ulcerated ' lungs, increasing emaciation, diarrhœa, cough, and all the sym- ' ptoms of pulmonary consumption;' to which all I need say is, that I can only be made *fairly answerable* for what was done for him while under *my care*,—but that it is rather a stretch of responsibility to make me answerable for him when under *the care of* Dr. Johnson, especially as neither that individual's mode of practice, nor very anxious endeavours, could be expected to be applied in a way most conducive to perfect the cure of one of my patients. But even after the publication of Dr. Johnson's letter in the *John Bull*, viz. on the 28th of September, Mr. N. writes to me in these words:

"'That through some *great mistake*, the simple though truly ' grateful testimony of thanks which I offered as a humble tribute ' for the almost miraculous improvement which I received when ' under your care, has thus been used as a weapon for destruction, ' instead of a shield of defence, cannot furnish a greater source of ' annoyance to yourself than to me. In justice to myself, I must ' express to you that I have never once mentioned the circumstance ' of having been under your care, without seizing the opportunity ' of explaining the rapid progress which I then made towards the ' restoration of my health. *Contrary, however, to your better judge- ' ment, I considered myself sufficiently restored to remove into the ' country. An unfortunate internal complaint then obliged me to apply ' to some eminent physician, and I tremulously acknowledge that the ' whole train of bad symptoms, expunged by your skill, are rapidly ' again reappearing.*'

" And this is my late patient's written testimony of the benefit he derived from consulting Dr. Johnson, who now turns round, and, with no common effrontery, accuses me of being the cause of the unfortunate gentleman's aggravated malady! though even he (as I have it also under Mr. N.'s hand), '*on first seeing him, expressed ' himself greatly surprised at his improved appearance.*'"

Why "the Profession"? Why his five pounds?

A variety of other sums were immediately upon this hint subscribed by the medical witnesses and others, whose names were duly recorded in the *Lancet*. The sums thus subscribed amounted in the whole to about 60*l.*, and if this was not a joining in, and adopting the acts of the prosecutor Wakley, I do not know what could be.

General Sharpe, in the letter before alluded to, in the note in p. 216, speaking of Sir Anthony Carlisle's conduct upon the occasion of the inquest, says: "I "cannot account for his conduct in any way except that "there must be *a cabal* of *older and more decided par-* "*tizans stirring on* that petulant and insolent crowd of "the medical tribe who have been hunting this poor "man to death and destruction."

As the more active part which the medical witnesses took in the general design appears so palpably in their own evidence, which I shall notice presently, I will not here allude to it more particularly.

Having thus demonstrated that a cabal, or whatever else the reader may please to call it, existed against me, and that its object was by procuring my imprisonment to put a stop to my practice; and having pointed out the parties who were aiding and abetting in the common design, I will now proceed to expose the means by which that result was sought to be obtained.

To show the spirit—the tumult—with which the medical advocates and cross-examiners conducted themselves, rendering the inquisition (to use the words of the Coroner,) "more like a bear-garden than any- "thing else," I here quote General Sharpe's descrip-

tion, extracted from the letter in the *John Bull* before alluded to:—

"Of the Court, Sir, it is impossible to speak in ap-
" propriate terms. I have been witness to almost all
" the party scenes and troubles from the French Revo-
" lution to this time, courts-martial, general, regi-
" mental and drum-head, but such a burlesque on jus-
" tice or decorum I never witnessed. Whatever may
" be Long's abilities, it is creditable to him that persons
" of all ranks, who were within moderate distance,
" crowded to support him, and it was the object of the
" ruffians to appal all, more particularly the female
" part, by the grossness of their questions and the per-
" versions of their answers, in which the reporters lent
" themselves in a manner the most scandalous. When
" an answer was given, Write down so and so, and not
" take down what had been said, was passing in too
" audible whispers; and of many tolerable remarks both
" of myself and others on the proceedings, not a word
" found its way to the public but what could be per-
" verted into something ridiculous."

But this was not the *only* way in which the case was got up, and the evidence to procure my conviction effected. I allude to the medical testimony. In order to affix criminality on me, it was necessary for the prosecutors to prove,

First, That I had made the original sore place upon the back;

Secondly, That that sore had caused the death of the young lady;

And *thirdly*, That I had done it in such a way as to affect me with criminality.

Of the first point there could be no doubt, but the

second was much more perplexing. A *common* sore of the size of the palm of Mr. Brodie's hand, it was quite clear could not of itself produce death; something *uncommon* must therefore be found about it,—some *sloughing*, some *mortification*, or some *gangrene*.

What says Mr. BRODIE?—"On examining her back, "witness found a *slough*, which might be as large as "the palm of his hand, all round which the skin was "discoloured to a considerable extent, as if it had been "inflamed, and was then threatening to become a *slough* "also." After she was dead "witness requested to "see the body, and on examining the back found that "the *sloughing* had very considerably extended, and "witness considered it to have been the cause of "death."

Mr. THOMAS KING says: "I saw on the back, be-"tween the shoulders or thereabouts, a large *eschar*, "or *disorganized* or *burnt* piece of skin. There was "no process of suppuration evident." *Q.* "Do you "believe mortification had taken place?" *A.* "*Mor-"tification* includes the idea of an *eschar* or *disorgani-"zation*, but you must understand that mortification, "as surgeons understand it, is sometimes applied to "the living parts as well as to the parts having been "discoloured; but *here* we understand in this case by "*mortification*, a complete DESTRUCTION *of the skin.* "The skin to that extent on the back was COMPLETELY "DESTROYED." *Q.* "Do you suppose, Sir, that that "was sufficient to cause death?" *A.* "Yes, decidedly. "From what I saw, I should say the injury on her back "was the sole cause of her death."

Dr. JOHN HOGG says: "The first thing that struck

"my notice was the extraordinary appearance of the "back: it presented between the shoulder-blades a "very large kind of *eschar*, or sore, apparently scorched. "I cannot compare it to anything better than a part "of the body which had been scorched by fire. I "should say that the violence done to the nervous "system here was quite sufficient to cause death, par-"ticularly in a nervous and delicate young lady."

Dr. James Johnson, whose letter I have before alluded to, says: "I conceive that she died from seve-"ral effects, the primary one being *local inflammation* "and *incipient gangrene*, and possibly the *inflamma-"tion* of the membranes of the stomach and pleura "connected with the *fever*."

Mr. Mackelcan says: "Dr. Hogg simply states "that the back was scorched, with which I coincide; "but I should say more than that; my own observa-"tion was that the structure of the back was *disor-"ganized* to a considerable extent. By *disorganiza-"tion* I mean the change was such as would unfit it "for its natural uses."

Mr. Thomas Evans says: "I merely would say as "the last witness did; if I add anything, it would be "in addition to his (Dr. Hogg's) evidence. I coincide "perfectly to the extent to which he has gone; but I "would observe, the *eschar* altered its character as it "approached the healthy structure, as if there was a "tendency to *gangrene* or *sloughing* going on, in ad-"dition to the dry eschar, producing of course a con-"siderable degree of irritation[1]."

---

[1] All these extracts are from the short-hand writer's notes of the Coroner's Inquest. I leave the reader to judge how well they square with the evidence some of these very gentlemen gave upon the subsequent trial, which will be found further on.

It is worthy of remark that none of these gentlemen examined the body the first time with Dr. Thomson and Mr. Wildgoose, when every part was minutely examined except the head and spine.

Now it will be noticed that in the evidence of these gentlemen there is a tolerable share of discrepancy. One says there was "a slough;" another says there was "mortification," that is, "a *complete destruction* "of the skin;" another, that there was the appearance of "a scorch or burn;" another, that there was incipient gangrene; another, that "the structure of the "back was disorganized to a considerable extent;" and the last, that there was "a tendency to gangrene or "sloughing going on"! One might infer from all this that there was a total disorganization or destruction of the parts; but the precise state of the case I am sure no one from this evidence could make out.

But how is it that at the lapse, as this was, of a week from the time of the decease, and after the body was proved to have entered its putrescent state[1], all these gentlemen could dare to be so positive as to the cause of death, when the best surgeons, uninfluenced by any party feeling, universally declare that after such a lapse of time it is physically impossible to tell, with any degree of certainty, what is the real cause of any person's death? It may be answered that they *chose to have it so*, and therefore *chose to swear it*.

So much for that! But how greatly will my readers

---

[1] The evidence is, that when the coffin was opened in the vault "the skin was peeling, apparently from the effects of decomposition, "the nails grown to a considerable length, the heart was in a state "of decomposition:" and again, Dr. James Johnson stated that "a "considerable degree of decomposition had taken place, and the "smell of the body and vaults generally was most offensive and "oppressive."

be astonished when they find that all this which they *chose to swear to,* was FLATLY CONTRADICTED by some of the other witnesses *for the prosecution,* and amongst others by my notable persecutor Dr. Thomson!

In his FIRST examination before the Coroner, Dr. Thomson said, "From the result of his examination he "could not ascertain the cause of the deceased's death. "There might be evidence of apoplexy in the head. "THERE WAS NO SLOUGHING ON THE BACK; "NO MORTIFICATION. There was no part on the "back, as far as he could ascertain, which had become "dead previous to the death of the deceased. The "appearances internally in the abdomen and thorax "were precisely similar to those found in the case of a "person who died at Chelsea from the effects of an "overdose of colchicum in the mixture containing six "ounces instead of six drams. Any medicine con-"taining a preparation from the same class of plants "would produce a similar effect. He *presumed* the "wound on the back was made to effect *counter-irri-"tation,* which is a common practice among the junior "branches of the profession. He could not give an "opinion as to the cause of death, not having examined "the head and spine. He could not say that the "state of the back was the cause of death."

Upon hearing this flat contradiction of Mr. Brodie's assertions, the jury became aroused, and expostulated with Dr. Thomson on the subject. Upon this he lost no time in removing the skin from the body where the irritation had taken place, and brought it on a plate to the jury, exclaiming, "There, gentlemen, is my proof, "for by mortification we mean the coming away of "dead parts. The structure of the part is NOT DE-

"STROYED OR DISORGANIZED, but is in a state of "*hyperorganization*"!

Now I would ask if the skin had been destroyed, as the other witnesses swore, how could it be produced by Dr. Thomson? Does this require one word of comment?

After this evidence was given, the second examination of the body was had, and then Dr. Thomson was asked by a juryman, what was the cause of hyperorganization? His evidence was, that "the cause of hy-
" perorganization described at the last meeting was the
" stimulus which had been used." The Coroner then asked him, "What was the result of all this further in-
" vestigation; what did he consider was the cause of
" the death?" *A.* "I have no other opinion to offer
" than the one I have recorded; but certainly I would
" say that the death arose chiefly from the SLOUGH IN
" THE BACK, the state of the stomach and the state
" of the pleura, which were as I have described; and
" the thickening of the coat of the spine, which is con-
" nected with the nerves of the arms, and which, form-
" ing part of the nerves used for the purpose of respi-
" ration, I cannot help thinking that the inflammation
" of the pleura, as well as the loaded state of the lungs,
" arose from the circumstance; that the death took
" place from the joint consequences of the inflamma-
" tion of the stomach, and the inflammation of the
" pleura, and inflammation of the back, caused by
" what is called irritative fever *produced by the appli-*
" *cation.* I believe the irritative fever to be the cause
" of the appearances found in the stomach, so as to
" bring on the *inflammation in the stomach*; and I be-
" lieve the irritative fever to be the cause of *the in-*

"*flammation in the pleura,* and the venous *congestion* "*of the lungs.*"

This latter part of his evidence, be it observed, was delivered on the evening of the 25th of August, so that though he swore on the *first occasion,* in direct opposition to the other witnesses before quoted, that there was "*no slough,*" and produced his proof, here he swears distinctly to there being "*a slough* on the back." Was there any reason ostensibly assigned for this change of opinion? NO. Was there *really* any assignable reason? YES: on that very day he had received the following letter from Mr. Brodie!!

"16 Saville Row,
August 25.

"Dear Sir,

"Will you be good enough to tell me for my own "information, First, Whether you discovered any fur-"ther morbid appearance in your second examination "of Miss Cashin's body? Secondly, Whether the turgid "state of the vessels of the mucous membrane of the "stomach, which you observed in the first examina-"tion, was more than might be expected to exist where, "from any cause, the patient had been affected with "long-continued retching and vomiting?

"If I understood you rightly yesterday, you found, "on examining the discoloured skin of the back, that "it was in such a state that the patient could not have "recovered (even if she had not sunk at the time she "did,) without a large portion of it being thrown off "as a dead substance, leaving an ulcer to heal by "granulations afterwards. Now this is all that I in-"tended to express when I said there was a *slough* on "the back, and I believe that others use the word in

" the same manner. *Will it not be better* to give some
" explanation to the Coroner and jury on this point, as
" they will *otherwise be liable to be perplexed* by think-
" ing that there is a DIFFERENCE OF OPINION between
" you and me, *when in reality there is* NO DIFFERENCE
" AT ALL?

" Believe me,

" Yours truly,

" B. C. BRODIE."

" *Dr. Alex. Thomson.*"

What right had Mr. Brodie to interfere with the witness in this manner? How dared he to suggest to him that there was "in reality no difference at all" between there being "*a slough* on the back" and there being "*no sloughing* on the back"? If Mr. Brodie and Dr. Thomson can reconcile this to the satisfaction of their own consciences, how do they propose to do it to the satisfaction of the public?

Now hear what Mr. WILDGOOSE says: "There was
" a dark spot upon the centre of the back, skin deep;
" the muscles underneath were not mortified. It is
" impossible for me to say what was the cause of death."
Q. "What do you think of the back—do you think
" that was a sufficient cause of death?" *A.* "If I had
" nothing but the back alone to go by, it would not."

What says Dr. GOODEVE to the question, "Do
" you think that (the wound) of itself was sufficient to
" cause death?"? *A.* "Certainly not, from what I
" saw; not unless accompanied by other symptoms.
" The mere wound would not be sufficient to cause
" death."

It will be recollected, that Mr. Brodie asserted that

an arsenious or some poisonous lotion had been applied by me to Miss Cashin's back. Dr. O'Shaugnessy took great pains to ascertain by analysation whether or not any poison had been applied to the skin. The Doctor first proves the skin to have been in existence, and secondly, "that he found upon it nothing *obnoxious to* "*life*, or calculated to produce any *injurious effects* upon "the animal system."

This, then, was the state of the medical evidence before the Coroner's inquest; but it will be recollected that, at the instance of Mr. Wakley, one whole session intervened between the inquest and my trial, and that Mr. Wakley, in the interval, had displaced the prosecutor bound over by the Coroner, and taken the whole management of the prosecution upon himself. Now let us see how the medical evidence appeared at the trial, all the witnesses, be it observed, being sworn to speak "the *whole* truth," as well as "the truth, and nothing "but the truth." I take the report from No. 375 of the *Lancet*.

"Mr. Benjamin Brodie.—I examined the person "of the young lady; I found it extensively inflamed; "the whole of the inflamed surface was about the size "of a plate; in the centre there was a spot nearly as "large as the palm of my hand, which was black, dead "—in a state which we call *sloughing*, or *mortification*[1]; "she was also suffering excessively from incessant sick-"ness; I was informed that nothing whatever would

---

[1] See Mr. Wakley's statement in the *Lancet* of the 30th November (*post*), that the part was shown, *previous to the trial*, to Mr. Brodie and *all the other witnesses*, and that then "*they all concurred* in the opinion that the skin was *not mortified*." How is this, Mr. Brodie?

" remain on her stomach ; I prescribed some medicine
" for her to take, merely with a view to allay the sick-
" ness ; nothing further could be done at that time, and
" a poultice was to be applied to the back. I thought
" her very ill indeed, *though I did not think that she*
" *was in that immediate danger which it appeared she*
" *was*; it appeared to me as if some powerful stimulating
" liniment had been applied to her back. I called at
" the house on the following afternoon, and found that
" she had died in the morning. I should think it was
" quite absurd to administer a tumbler of mulled port
" wine; it could not be expected to stay on her sto-
" mach. I should not think it right to apply a stimu-
" lating liniment to the back of a person *in perfect*
" *health* to produce such a sore, nor do I think that any
" of the stimulating liniments in ordinary use would
" produce the same effects—the same extensive mis-
" chief: I mean by that to include both the constitu-
" tional effects and the local effects. *In my opinion,*
" the sickness and vomiting were as much the effect of
" what had been done as the MORTIFICATION.

" By Mr. Baron GARROW.—I think the application
" of *such a liniment* to a person of the deceased's age,
" sex, and condition, was likely to produce disease and
" danger; *and it has fallen to my lot to see a case simi-*
" *lar since this occurrence.*

" By the COURT.—There is great difference in con-
" stitutions; and I do not mean to say that it would
" produce equal danger in all cases. It is the practice
" of some medical men to apply stimulants to the chests
" of persons labouring under consumption. I knew
" nothing of the young lady before the Monday. Wine
" would have been proper in this case if the stomach

"could have borne it, administered in moderate quan-
"tities. I was not present at any of the *post mortem*
"examinations, but I can say, *that what I saw on the*
"*back was quite sufficient to account for death.*

"Dr. ALEXANDER THOMSON.—I am a Batchelor
"of Medicine. I have heard Mr. Brodie's evidence,
"and I *perfectly agree* with his opinion.

"Mr. THOMAS KING.—I attended the examination
"of the body of the deceased, at the chapel in Moor-
"fields, on the 24th of August; I observed the state
"of the back; there was a piece of dead or *disorganized*
"skin—such as we call an *eschar*, and which Mr. Bro-
"die has called *a slough*—between the shoulders, about
"the size of my hat; the parts immediately beneath
"the skin were gorged in a watery fluid called *serum.*
"I examined, in company with Dr. Hogg, Mr. James
"Johnson, Dr. Maclean, and others, the body, *to see*
"*if there was any latent disease: we discovered none;*
"*the vital parts of the body appeared to me in a toler-*
"*ably healthy state,* such as the body of a previously
"healthy person would have after lying a short time
"in the earth.

"Dr. JAMES JOHNSON.—*There was no other* AP-
"PEARANCE *of disease except the wound on the back.*

"Dr. JOHN HOGG.—The wound on the back ap-
"peared as if produced by gunpowder. The sheath
"of the spinal marrow was discoloured opposite the
"external wound, from which he concluded that there
"had been great constitutional disturbance. The vio-
"lence done to a delicate and nervous young lady was
"enough to cause death.

"Dr. GOODEVE.—He would not have inflicted such
"a wound."

Where is the mention here of the symptoms of inflammation found in the stomach and duodenum? Was there a word of the purulent fluid and cicatrices in the lungs, or of the congestion mentioned by Dr. Thomson at the Inquest? Not a syllable is to be found of all this; but, on the contrary, the fact of there being any other "latent disease" is distinctly negatived, "the "vital parts of the body" being described to have been "in a tolerably healthy state," there being "no other "*appearance of disease* except the wound on the "back."!!!

What is the commentary of even my prosecutor Wakley upon Mr. Brodie and his testimony? "Mr. "Brodie, who visited Miss Catherine Cashin about "ten hours previous to her death, stated, at the In-"quest, that he found Miss Catherine Cashin's back "'*mortified*'. This was a fact of *great importance*, "for here we have direct evidence of the *wretch's* "brutal ignorance of even the rudiments of medical "practice. What says Mrs. Roddis? 'Long directed "'me to give the deceased a tumbler full of mulled "'wine.' What said Long to Mrs. General Sharpe? "'The deceased had inflammation of the stomach;' "and what was the monstrous remedy? a TUMBLER "OF MULLED WINE[1]. There was a point of great im-"portance fully established; *but in comes* Mr. BRODIE, "*who by one thoughtless movement had nearly kicked* "*down* THE WHOLE FABRIC. At the time that Mr. "Brodie was examined at the Inquest he had un-"doubtedly some ground for believing that the skin "was '*mortified*'; for, upon looking at the part, a

---

[1] Half a wine-glass only was ordered, and that not mulled.

" mere view must have led the most experienced eye
" to believe it was in that state; and Mr. Brodie only
" saw it. At that time the part had not been cut into,
" and he merely judged of its condition from the
" greenish black appearance. The body, however, sub-
" sequently underwent a most minute and careful
" *post mortem* inspection; a portion of the skin was
" removed; it was shown to Mr. Brodie and the other
" medical witnesses; ALL CONCURRED IN THE
" OPINION THAT THE SKIN WAS NOT MORTIFIED.
" In a word, with the exception of the dark film or
" pellicle which appeared to have been produced upon
" the surface of the cutis, the cuticle having been en-
" tirely abraded, the skin was not only not 'mortified',
" but *unusually vascular. There was no coagulated*
" *blood, no line of separation, no yielding of texture;*
" *in fact, with the exception of the dark external appear-*
" *ance,* THERE WAS NOT A SINGLE CIRCUMSTANCE
" TO JUSTIFY ANY MAN IN ASSERTING THAT THE
" STATE OF THE PART EVEN INDICATED THE
" APPROACH OF MORTIFICATION. *Then how inac-*
" *curate, and therefore unfortunate, was the evidence of*
" *Mr. Brodie!* Besides, there is an UNACCOUNTABLE
" disagreement between the opinion which that gen-
" tleman says he entertained of the condition of the
" wound *and the treatment which he adopted.*

* * *

" In a word, if Mr. Brodie were correct in his diagno-
" sis, *his treatment was miserably incorrect* and ineffi-
" cient; but having been *completely wrong* in his dia-
" gnosis, *his error had nearly caused the escape of the*
" *felon* LONG[1]."

---

[1] *Lancet* of the 13th of November 1830.

It may be asked why did not my Counsel explain all these facts to the jury? Why was not a strict cross-examination of the medical witnesses instituted? Why was it not proved that unless there was a latent disease the fluid applied would not cause any sore, and that a sore being made was *proof* of there being latent disease? It was my misfortune to have too *good* a case *in point of* LAW[1], for my Counsel to trouble themselves with discrediting the evidence. Earnestly did I entreat my leading Counsel (now one of the Barons of

---

[1] From the report of my trial in the *Lancet*, No. 375, which is as follows, this is quite manifest:—

" The case for the prosecution here ended.

" Mr. GURNEY submitted that there was *no case to go to the jury*; " there was no evidence to show that the deceased had been in " any respect differently treated from the other patients in attend- " ance upon Mr. Long. He had applied to her *the same remedy* " which he had applied in other cases, and which had been so ap- " plied with the most complete success.

" Mr. Serjeant ANDREWS followed Mr. Gurney on the same side, " pressing upon the attention of the Court the view that Lord Hale " and Mr. Justice Blackstone took of cases of medical practice, ob- " serving that however liable formerly to actions, if not regularly " licensed, medical practitioners could not be found guilty of man- " slaughter. The question which he conceived presented itself to " the Court was, whether or not Mr. Long had assiduously used " those remedies which his means and education enabled him. If " he acted *bonâ fide*, however mistaken, he could not be held as " having committed a criminal act.

" Mr. ADOLPHUS followed on the same side.

" Mr. Justice PARK said, that he had consulted with his learned " brother, and found that their views of the case did not coincide " upon the *whole* matter; therefore he should not feel himself justi- " fied in *stopping* the case.

" Mr. Baron GARROW observed, that he felt bound to state his " impression respecting the present case. It was his opinion that " if, upon the facts of the case, it did turn out that the jury was " unfavourable to the prisoner, *the question of law* OUGHT *to be sub-* " *mitted to the solemn adjudication of the congregated wisdom of all*

the Exchequer), by several notes during the trial, to expose the combination against me on cross-examination; but to the surprise and annoyance of myself and listening friends, witness after witness left the box without a question being put to them, and all the reason I could get from Mr. Gurney was that he thought it advisable not to do so. Neither would he call any of my witnesses upon that point; a distinguished Fellow of the College of Physicians was present to expose the whole matter: this gentleman, after a due consideration, and

---

"*the Judges: at that stage of the trial he should himself recom-*
"*mend that the opinion of the jury be taken upon the question of*
"*fact, and leave to the Judges at large to* DECIDE *the question at*
"*law.* Adverting to the case of Mr. Van Butchell, he observed
"that Mr. Baron Hullock was perfectly right in stopping the case.
"There, excellent grounds existed for his doing so, which did by no
"means apply to that then before the jury; and it was further to
"be remembered that in Mr. Van Butchell's case no third person was
"present during the application of the remedies or the performance
"of the operation. When he considered the several authorities
"affecting the present question, he must say there was not the
"slightest distinction between the conduct of the most eminent
"physician or surgeon, or the poorest, humblest and least educated
"man in the community. No matter whether prejudice, ignorance
"or poverty brought his patients to Mr. Long, *he must stand in a*
"*court of criminal judicature exactly in the same situation as would*
"*the President of the College of Physicians or the President of the*
"*College of Surgeons; the humblest and the highest ought to occupy*
"*precisely the same situation.* The ONLY question was, whether
"the prisoner at the bar had USED SUFFICIENT CARE AND DILI-
"GENCE IN THE APPLICATION OF A REMEDY which he apparently
"believed to be efficacious. Were he drunk, or did he do that which
"on the face of it could not fail to be mischievous, the law would
"hold him to have acted criminally. But his (Baron Garrow's)
"reading of the law was, that *the humblest bone-setter in the re-*
"*motest village stood in the same situation, in regard to a* CRIMINAL
"PROSECUTION, *as if he were the President of the most distinguished*
"*college in the United Kingdom.*"

Again, Mr. Justice PARK in his charge to the jury said, "He held,

having satisfied himself by a personal examination, subsequently published his approval of my system; but my Counsel refused to call him. This was the case with other witnesses; and, in a word, none of those who were there ready to disprove the evidence for the prosecution were called, and the *ex parte* statements of my persecutors went to the jury without an attempt at contradiction or explanation.

The contrary line of defence was anticipated and dreaded by my persecutors, in proof of which hear

---

" and he believed there could be no second opinion amongst law-
" yers on the subject, that nothing but the grossest ignorance or
" the most criminal inattention could render any man, licensed or
" unlicensed, amenable for his medical practice to a court of crimi-
" nal judicature. He then read over his notes to the jury, who im-
" mediately retired to consider their verdict.

" A little after 7 o'clock Mr. Justice PARK again entered the Court,
" and ordered the jury to be called, apparently with an intention, if
" they had not agreed on their verdict, to apprise them of his wish
" to retire for the night, and that they must therefore be locked up
" until Monday morning. The jury did not immediately obey the
" summons, but in the course of about five minutes they returned
" into the box, and were then asked if they had as yet agreed on
" their verdict? The foreman instantly answered, Yes; and that
" they found the prisoner—guilty.

" The expression of this opinion, *so different from what was an-
" ticipated by the audience in Court from the summing up of the learned
" Judge, excited very great surprise.* His Lordship, *who seemed to
" be very little prepared for such a verdict,* then consulted for a few
" minutes in great apparent earnestness with the Recorder, and
" immediately afterwards begged the Sheriff to request the attend-
" ance of his brother Garrow.

" Mr. Baron GARROW, the Sheriffs, and a number of Aldermen
" and Magistrates then entered the Court, and a consultation between
" the two learned Judges and the Recorder was then renewed for
" several minutes. At its conclusion, Mr. Justice PARK addressed
" the Counsel for the prisoner, and observed that *under the peculiar
" circumstances of the case,* he and his learned brother had agreed to
" defer passing judgment on the prisoner until Monday morning."

what Drs. Ryan and James Johnson say. Dr. RYAN, in commenting on the evidence given at the Inquest, says: "The diversity of opinion among the medical "men as to the exact nature of the disease is highly "discreditable to the majority of them as men of sci-"ence and medical jurists. We entertain no doubt "but all will receive A FORMIDABLE CROSS-EXAMINA-"TION at the trial: we apprehend the Judge will ex-"patiate upon the discrepancy of the evidence, and "AS TO MR. LONG, HE WILL COME OFF "WITH FLYING COLOURS."

Dr. JAMES JOHNSON, the "five-pounder" and *witness*, says, "St. John Long and his friends need not despair. "We think there is a great probability of his being "ACQUITTED OF MANSLAUGHTER either by "the grand or petit jury[1]."

The Coroner in his charge to the jury at the Inquest declared, that "*it did not appear to him that he* (*Mr.* "*Long*) *could be accused criminally in this case.* If, "gentlemen," continued he, "every person who ad-"ministers blisters or physic, or performs operations, is "to be made answerable for the consequences, God "knows it would be a lamentable situation to be in. "You have had the opinion, one after another, of ladies "and gentlemen who have been patients of Mr. Long, "who all express their confidence in his skill, and that "they are indebted to him for their recovery, a great "many of them, and that others are being put in a "course of recovery that hardly could have been hoped "for, for that seems to be the opinion of a great many; "indeed all of them, either one or the other—either

---

[1] *Medico-Chirurgical Review*, September 1830.

"that they are totally restored or in a way of being "restored by this gentleman. If all the patients "which this gentleman has operated upon during the "whole course of his practice were to come here and "they were all to repeat their confidence in his treat-"ment, I do not think it would be stronger than you "have it already upon the subject; so it appears to "me. These persons, whether rightly or otherwise, "feel confidence in what was done to them, and most "of them have said that if they had occasion to have "recourse to medical advice, they would go back to "Mr. Long, notwithstanding all they have heard."

Of this opinion as to the groundlessness of the charge against me was the Judge who tried me. Hear what Mr. Justice PARK said in his charge to the jury, —"that for himself he knew nothing whatever about "the case except what he had heard that day in Court, "and what he had learnt from the depositions laid be-"fore him: that he had formed his judgment upon "them, and he could not help saying that HE THOUGHT "IT MOST UNFORTUNATE THAT THE COUNSEL FOR "THE PRISONER SHOULD HAVE SOUGHT FOR AN "IMMEDIATE ACQUITTAL before the DEFENCE was "entered on, because it led to an apparent difference of "opinion between him and his learned brother. That "difference was not so much as to the law of the case, "as with respect to the course which it was then ex-"pedient to pursue. He held, and he believed there "could be no second opinion amongst lawyers on the "subject, that nothing but the grossest ignorance or "the most criminal inattention could render any man, "licensed or unlicensed, amenable for his medical "practice to a court of criminal judicature." His

lordship referred, for confirmation of his own opinion as to the law of the case, to Hale's Pleas of the Crown, vol. i. chap. 33. and other authorities, and said, "If a "physician gives a person a potion without any intent "of doing him any bodily hurt, but with an intent to "cure or prevent a disease, and, contrary to the expec-"tation of the physician, it kills him, this is no *homi-"cide*. And the like of a chirurgeon (3 Ed. 3. Coron. "163.). And I hold their opinions to be erroneous that "think that if he be no licensed chirurgeon or physi-"cian who occasions this mischance, that then it is "*felony*; for physic and salves were before licensed "physicians and chirurgeons; and therefore if they "be not licensed, according to the statute of 3 Henry "VIII. cap. 11. or 14 Henry VIII. cap. 5., they are sub-"ject to certain penalties; but God forbid that any "mischance of this kind should make any person not "licensed guilty of *murder* or *manslaughter*! These "opinions, (that it is felony,) therefore, may serve to "caution ignorant people not to be busy in tampering "with physic, but are no safe rule for a Judge or jury "to go by. We see the statute of 34 and 35 Henry "VIII. cap. 8. dispenses with *the penalty* of those "former statutes *as to outward applications* and medi-"cines for agues, stone, or strangury, which may be "administered by any person; and the preamble of "the statute tells us that if none but licensed chirur-"geons should be used in many cases, many of the "king's subjects were like to perish for want of help: "and certainly if that opinion should obtain, that if "one, *not* licensed a physician, should be guilty of "felony if his patient miscarry, we should have many "of the poorer sort of people, especially remote

"from London, die for want of help, lest their in-
"tended helpers might miscarry. This doctrine,
"therefore, that 'if any one dies under the hands of
"'an unlicensed physician, it is felony,' is apocry-
"phal, and fitted, I fear, only to gratify and flatter
"*doctors licensed in physic*; though it may, as I said
"before, have its use to make people cautious and
"wary how they take upon them too much in this
"dangerous employment." The learned Judge then strongly censured the reporters of the press for admitting into circulation exparte statements to my prejudice, and remarked with much energy, that "he questioned
"much whether the President of the College of Phy-
"sicians or Surgeons could produce such a body of
"evidence of their success as the gentleman at the
"bar had done of his (pointing at the same time to my
"numerous patients on his left and right hand). He
"could not let pass that opportunity of saying that he
"always thought, ever since he had had the power of
"thinking, that there could not be a more dangerous
"error than to permit the previous publication of evi-
"dence which was afterwards to come before a jury.
"Whether prejudice, confidence, ignorance or poverty,
"brought his patients to Mr. Long, he must stand in
"a court of criminal judicature exactly in the same
"situation as would the President of the College of
"Physicians or the President of the College of Sur-
"geons."

When the verdict was given contrary to what the Judges anticipated, so much, I have been informed, did they feel the difficulty they were thereby placed in, that in the interval between my being found guilty and sentence being passed upon me, they sent the deposi-

tions to the then Lord Chief Justice, requesting his advice. The reply was, "Fine him one shilling, and dis-"charge him." This would, I have reason to believe, have been done, and the matter would most probably there have rested, but Mr. Baron GARROW suggested a fine of 250*l.*, just enough to make it worth my while to bring a writ of error to reverse the judgment and save my money by having the matter argued before the twelve Judges, according to his Lordship's suggestion made at the time my Counsel moved to stop the case *in limine.* Unfortunately this mode of proceeding was not explained to me at the time, and I was not aware until lately that it could have been done at all.

Having thus gone through the medical evidence, let us see if it is possible to discover from it THE TRUE CAUSE OF THIS YOUNG LADY'S DEATH.

This, I think, can be done satisfactorily from the *post mortem* examination of Dr. Thomson and Mr. Wildgoose [1], given in by them at the Inquest, not one word

---

[1] The following is the part of the examination I allude to. After describing the sore on the back, it proceeds:—"The left cavity of "the thorax contained about one ounce and a half of sanious serum, "but neither in its costal diaphragmatic or pulmonary portion was "traversed by vessels containing red blood. The lungs on this side "readily collapsed and expelled the whole of the air, and appeared "of a dark greenish blue hue exteriorly, and interiorly of a purple port "wine hue, apparently from *venous congestion.* The lungs of the "right side were of the same hue and appearance as those of the "left." The report then describes the symptoms of consumption manifest, and proceeds as follows:—"The stomach was externally "of a red hue as if stained with blood, and contained internally "about half a wine-glass full of dark greenish brown, fetid, viscid "mucus, and had its mucous membrane most minutely and densely "studded with stellulæ of red vessels, particularly in the cardiac "portion of its greater curvature. The same appearance was ob-"served in the first three inches of the duodenum. The whole of "the surface of the ilion was covered with thick, pappy, reddish, "translucent and somewhat viscid mucus."

of which appeared at the trial. The state of medical science in England is, however, such that it obliges me to seek the necessary medical proof from the French. In Richeraud's Physiology, p. 105, we find a passage of which the following is a translation: "Those who "have practised in large hospitals know to how many "patients *indigestions* (or *indigestible things*) are fatal. "I have seen some with *large ulcers, suppuration was* "*copious and healthy, the granulations florid,* and all "promising a happy issue, when ignorant friends bring "them by stealth *indigestible food.* The stomach is "charged with a centre of *fluxion* (or *attraction*), to-"wards which all the juices and *humours* tend, and "*irritation* is produced greater than that on the ulcer-"ated surface. The lungs become the seat of *inflam-*"*matory congestion,* and the patients die at the end of "two or three days, sometimes in twenty-four hours; "and this fatal termination is especially accelerated "when, as I have often witnessed, a blister is applied "to the seat of the pain instead of the ulcerated sur-"face."

I put it to any impartial person whether Dr. Thomson's examination of the body does not coincide in every particular with the symptoms described here by Richeraud? Had I been aware of the *plums and grapes,* I should have pointed out the *certainty* of death if my application was not instantly renewed to the back. Does, then, A SHADOW OF BLAME ATTACH TO MY CONDUCT?

But see the dilemma the medical men are in if they deny the correctness of this view of the case. Dr. Thomson describes the internal symptoms as precisely similar to a case of poison which occurred at Chelsea. Now there is no evidence here, that Mr. Brodie's pre-

scription was *accurately* made up; no evidence that if it was accurately made up it was the medicine *sent to the house* by the chemist who made it up; no evidence that it was the *medicine* which was administered: and therefore it is possible, *first*, that some *mistake* was made in *compounding* it, as occurred in the case at Chelsea alluded to by Dr. Thomson; *secondly*, that some *mistake* was made in the *delivery* at the deceased's house, as happened when Captain Burdett lost his life; and *thirdly*, that by some mistake some *poisonous* embrocation or other mixture was administered instead of the medicine ordered, an accident by which so many have lost their lives. But, no! it cannot be: Richeraud IS RIGHT, and has described the case as minutely as if he had seen the deceased.

Was it ignorance, then, after their very minute examination of the body, that prevented my medical persecutors recognising these symptoms after the evidence about the plums and grapes? It cannot be attributed to that; for all the witnesses for the prosecution profess, I believe, to be well acquainted with the French medical works, and one of them—*Mr. King*, the man who deposed, at the trial, to there being "no other appear-"ance of disease except the wound on the back,"—practised for some years as house surgeon in one of the large Parisian hospitals, and is, or was, I have heard, the personal friend of the author quoted. No! it could not have been from ignorance; for the suppression of all mention at the trial of the internal inflammation and the congestion of the lungs gives a pretty good intimation of what they believed to be really the case. It could not have been ignorance, because, if they intended to act fairly and honestly, it was their bounden duty,

after they had made themselves masters of the case, which neither I nor any one else can entertain a doubt that they did, to have stated *the facts, and* ALL *the facts,* as they were sworn to do, without *suppression* or *perversion.* NO! I WAS TO BE PUT DOWN, MY PRACTICE ANNIHILATED, AND MY DISCOVERY SMOTHERED, AT ALL HAZARDS AND BY EVERY KIND OF MEANS.

It would be a waste of words to make an observation upon this development of the foul scheme to which I fell a victim; for I am quite sure that every thinking and honourable mind must revolt at a plot so vile and brought about by such base and despicable means.

II.

I HAVE already stated that my remedies never caused a wound, produced blisters, broke the skin, or caused mortification, and that the same remedy which produced a discharge, by its daily application, healed the part affected. These facts are confirmed by every patient that attended my practice-room. I now beg attention to the case of Mrs. Lloyd, on account of whose death I was also charged, by my persecutors, with manslaughter, but most honourably acquitted. This case exhibits in a striking manner the fatal consequences of retarding the humours in the system. I select this because the faculty make use of it to my injury; but I shall clearly show that even their own testimony concurs with that of all my patients, and fully supports my arguments.

Mrs. Campbell deposed as follows at the Inquest, when speaking of the appearances of Mrs. Lloyd's chest; but I should first observe that the inflammation the witnesses here describe was produced and aggravated by the, in this instance, dangerous and fatal plasters and dressings applied by Mr. Campbell, the medical attendant who administered his remedies a day prior to my attendance being dispensed with, when, of course, he took all responsibility upon himself. These plasters and dressings, Captain Lloyd acknowledges in his evidence, I strongly condemned the last time I saw Mrs. Lloyd. Mrs. Campbell deposed as follows.

"I saw it (the chest) and it was in a very vivid "state of inflammation. I think the skin was not "broken at the time. * * *
"It seemed to ooze out water in different places, but "particularly from the wound in the centre, which was "as large as *the top of a tea-cup*. The wound ap-"peared to me, at the time, to be on the *surface*. The "place at first in the centre appeared of a more vivid "red, and afterwards of a watery colour.

* * *

"I think Mr. Campbell applied the simple dressing "to the sore before Mr. Long saw her for the last "time."

This is the state of the case as far as I am concerned, and as far as the public can feel interested as to my innocence or guilt; for in this evidence it is clearly shown that my remedy neither broke the skin nor produced a wound, and has done nothing more than produce a simple discharge under a cabbage-leaf, and that the irritation was not larger than the top of a tea-cup.

Mrs. Campbell declares that water was flowing from what she is pleased to call a wound; but she had not the candour to state that the symptoms she described were produced by the irritating and therefore dangerous agents applied by her son.

Captain Lloyd deposed as follows:—" There was a " vivid redness across the breast where the rubbing " had taken place, and a dark place in the centre of the " breast, from which a discharge of a dirty white thick " substance was taking place from under the cabbage-" leaves which had been applied to her breast, as she " said, by the direction of Mr. St. John Long. The " dark large spot on her breast still got deeper in " colour. The edges were white and all much puffed " up. The pores of the skin upon that dark spot were " much expanded; it did not break, but only dis-" charged."

Thanks to Captain Lloyd for this evidence, because by it he not only proves my innocence, but again supports the evidence of all my patients; namely, that my remedy only produces a redness on the skin without breaking it, from whence a discharge of a dirty white thick substance takes place under a cabbage-leaf. This evidence establishes the fact that my remedy produced no blisters, and consequently proves Mr. Campbell to be the author of those which appeared in the subsequent days of Mrs. Lloyd's illness. Captain Lloyd also proves Mrs. Campbell's evidence to be in part incorrect, because that which she calls *a watery discharge* he (Captain Lloyd) calls *a thick substance*, which is the true description. This shows the fairness with which Captain Lloyd gave his testimony, although it is remarkable that when he was pressed at the trial to

admit certain material facts, he affected tears and want of utterance, and confessed that "he had no wish to "follow up the prosecution, but was compelled to do "it by the medical profession." So much for my persecutors following up the object of their former purpose with the utmost rigour!

Mr. Campbell, the medical attendant who succeeded me, gives his evidence with greater incaution than the two former witnesses; for he stated on oath, that "the "wound I have mentioned on her chest was twenty "inches in length, independently of the inflammation "which extended over the belly and all down her "sides, over the hips and over the shoulders." He proves distinctly that there was no mortification on the wound when he was first called in to attend her on the 12th of October, nor for eight days after.

Here it will be observed that Mr. Campbell flatly contradicts the evidence both of his mother and Captain Lloyd; for the irritation which Mrs. Campbell declares to be only as large as "the top of a tea-cup," Mr. Campbell declares to be twenty inches, independent of the inflammation. Surely Mrs. Campbell's tea-cups must be goodly sized punch-bowls! But to show the impossibility of Mr. Campbell's statement being even probable, let any lady or gentleman of tolerable size take a rule, and measure from the chest down or across, and then judge of the falseness of the statement, leaving the further extent of inflammation for imagination.

Captain Lloyd states, that the bright redness was only produced where the rubbing had taken place on the chest, and from whence the discharge proceeded. No one has stated or believed that Mrs. Lloyd was

rubbed all over the abdomen, or down the hips, or had cabbage-leaves applied to those parts. Yet Mr. Campbell wickedly insinuated as much. *In nine days after Mr. Campbell commenced his practice,* Mr. Vance was called in, who states the appearances as he then found them, which, he says, enabled him to give, "in a correspondence with her distant friends, encouraging hopes of her amendment." He deposes as follows:

"By the inhalation, it appeared to me that her tongue, mouth, and fauces were *eroded.* On examining her chest, I found a sloughing sore of *great extent,* where she had been rubbed, by her own account, with a liniment, which extended from the armpits across the chest in one direction, and from the collar-bones above and under the nipples in the other direction. In the middle, the soft parts covering the breast-bone were black and dead; but towards the circumference there was a little appearance of health, and the mortified parts were separating from the living. * * * In my opinion, the application of some corrosive matter made to the parts which I found in a state of mortification, was the cause of her death."

This evidence of Mr. Vance ought not and could not be received in reference to my practice, but wholly in condemnation of Mr. Campbell's, because no part of it describes the state Mrs. Lloyd was in when she was taken out of my hands, but only the effects produced by Mr. Campbell's treatment. No honest witness could swear to what he had not seen: but Mr. Vance was not quite so nice in giving evidence to a Jury, composed of the near neighbours and friends of the parties concerned, and who, no doubt, believed all they heard.

Mr. Vance, wishing to leave no part of my practice uncensured, deposed at the Coroner's Inquest, that, in his opinion, the inhaling produced ulceration or erosion in Mrs. Lloyd's throat; but when he afterwards found that a number of other ladies inhaled the same day, and from the same machine from which Mrs. Lloyd inhaled, and that Captain Lloyd's son continued eight or nine days at my house inhaling, after his mother was taken out of my hands, without any one of them receiving injury, but on the contrary, according to Captain Lloyd's subsequent statements, deriving benefit, he dropped that part of his evidence at the trial. Again, if the inhaling properties could ulcerate the throat, they must have ulcerated the lungs also; but *on examination of the body the lungs were declared by four surgeons to be perfectly sound.*

Mr. Vance contradicts Mrs. Campbell and Captain Lloyd in their statements; for he infers that my liniment was originally applied to a greater extent than either Mrs. Lloyd, Mrs. Campbell, or Captain Lloyd admit, who had the opportunity of seeing the extent of the sore place at first. If Mr. Vance had spoken correctly, he would have been obliged, from the facts within his knowledge, to have stated as follows:

"That from the facts communicated to me, Mr. "Long only produced a discharge of putrescent matter "or morbific humour through the pores of the skin from "a spot about the circumference of 'the top of a tea-"'cup,' and by its action the skin was not broken, nor did "it produce any injury; on the contrary, if the same "system were followed up, Mrs. Lloyd must have been "relieved from her disease, because the true principle "of counter-irritation in our practice is to give relief by

" drawing away a humour. Mr. Long, however, has cer-
" tainly done more than this in a manner most extra-
" ordinary, for he has accomplished this great object
" without breaking the skin. Besides, all medical men
" must agree, that a vivid or bright redness denotes
" the most healthy action; but I find, as Mr. Campbell
" progressed in the case, that the parts became in-
" flamed and darkened in colour, appearances which
" must have been produced by some substance applied
" by Mr. Campbell, the effects of which were to retain
" the bad humours in the part until they caused mortifi-
" cation. We know of no poison or substance that could
" lie dormant on the skin eight days and then cause
" mortification; for if it were a caustic, it would have
" burnt immediately, at least skin deep; if otherwise,
" it must have been removed by the discharge. The
" party who retained the humours in the system is
" therefore accountable for the death of Mrs. Lloyd,
" since if mortification caused the death of the lady,
" the keeping the humours in the body brought it on.
" It is impossible to suppose that whilst, out of all Mr.
" Long's practice, no other instance of mortification
" occurred; it should take place in this solitary case,
" for there is not a tittle of evidence to throw a sha-
" dow of suspicion on his practice. I will not say as
" Dr. Thomson said, when he flourished his knife
" over the dead body of Miss Cashin, 'We have been
" 'a long time looking for one of Long's patients; we
" 'have got one now, and we will settle him.' I
" did not join with others in declaring our intention
" that an Inquest should take place over the remains
" of Mrs. Lloyd in her presence, some days before her
" decease, although she implored us not to expose her

" body after death. Nor did I anticipate the verdict " of a jury long before the Inquest was held. Neither " did I suppose or desire that Mr. Campbell's friends " and next door neighbours should form that jury."

Had you, Mr. Vance, stated this to the Jury, you would have left the witness-box and the Court with some credit to yourself; but the jury did not give the weight you anticipated to your evidence, and I was consequently acquitted. But see the situation you are in: Though you were not an eye-witness of it, you approved of Mr. Campbell's treatment; and what was the result of his treatment? Why, no other than that which caused the death of Mrs. Lloyd! But you were an after-actor in the tragedy, and this may in some degree excuse you: you were not able to swear to *that* which Mr. Campbell had done: but you could give ample evidence as to what I had done: you could only judge of *what* Mr. Campbell had done by the effects you saw: but how will you account to me and to the public for concealing that Mrs. Lloyd had *erysipelas* operating extensively upon her? You made this confession to those whom you wished to join you in this attempt to "settle" me. Did Mr. Brodie, Mr. Campbell, and yourself agree in consultation to keep this a secret?

One word more. When Mr. Vance was asked by a juryman at the trial if he had been called in to attend Mrs. Lloyd before any injury occurred, could he not have saved her? he shrugged up his shoulders, looked pale, and said, "It is a difficult question to answer; it " would implicate another:" upon which the jurymen shook their heads, and desired him to go down.

Mr. Brodie, a voluntary witness, offered his gratuitous services two days before Mrs. Lloyd's death, to see

the unfortunate lady, and he deposed "that the effects "produced (such as I have described,) were, in his opi-"nion, sufficient to occasion death." And what, then, were these effects? Why, no other than those produced by Messrs. Campbell and Vance. On what grounds, I inquire, could Mr. Brodie attach blame to my practice, not having seen the remedies that were applied by any of the party? Surely he could not imagine that a discharge flowing from a simple redness on the skin could produce any ill consequences. If he did conceive this, why does he ever recommend the use of a blister, which invariably removes the outer skin? Now he had ample evidence adduced, both by Mr. Campbell and Captain Lloyd, to convince him that the effects produced by my remedy were not so violent as those of a blister, unless he chooses to say that death ought to take place from a simple redness of the skin! Oh! Mr. Brodie! Mr. Brodie!! Mr. Brodie!!!

INDICES.

INDEX TO THE MEDICAL AUTHORS QUOTED IN SUPPORT OF MR. LONG'S SYSTEM.

Mr. Abernethy, 9, 27, 46, 68, 71, 72, 77.
Dr. Ainslie, 2.
Dr. Alexander, 49, 50, 60.
M. Andral, 57, 69.

M. Bichat, 24.
Dr. Burrows, 23, 75, 76, 77, 83, 84.

Sir Anthony Carlisle, 24.
Dr. Reid Clancy, 52.
Dr. (now Sir Charles) Clarke, 40.
Sir Astley Cooper, 25, 58, 64, 65.
Professor Cooper, 63.
Sir Alexander Crichton, 77.
Dr. Cullen, 50.
Mr. Curtis, 74.

Dr. Darwin, 50.
Sir Humphry Davy, 1, 11.
Dr. Duncan, 51, 52.

M. Etmüller, 60.

Dr. Fosbrooke, 73.

Dr. Gowerson, 57.
Dr. G. Gregory, 69.

Sir Henry Halford, 78, 79, 80.

Dr. Hamilton, 38.
Dr. Harrison, 50.
M. Frederick Hoffman, 50.
Mr. John Hunter, 5, 7, 20, 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 45, 47, 53, 54, 62.

Mr. Lawrence, 1, 10, 11, 18, 21, 22, 25, 48, 49, 50, 60.

Dr. Macculloch, 50.
Dr. Morrison, 4, 5, 24, 25, 26, 40, 41.

Dr. North, 29, 38, 39, 40, 46, 47, 60, 61, 70.

Mr. Pearson, 2, 8, 12, 13, 18, 20.

Dr. Ramadge, 35.
Dr. Richard Reece, 55.
Dr. Ryan, 18.

M. Stahl, 50.

Dr. Thompson, 21, 22.
Dr. Alexander Thomson, 35.

Dr. Uwins, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 29, 43, 60, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73.

Mr. Wakley, 35.

INDEX TO THE DISEASES TREATED OF IN THE FOREGOING WORK.

Abscess, 8, 10.
Asthma, 79, 80.

Boils, 10.

Cancer, 10.
Cholera Morbus, 166, 167.
Colds, 143.
Consumption and Pulmonary complaints, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 104, 116, 117, 125, 126, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 143, 144, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187.

Determination of blood to the head, 66, 67, 68, 107, 199.
Dropsy, &c., 66.

Epilepsy, 69, 70, 71.
Exfoliation of bone, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172.

Fever, 48, 96.
—— puerperal, 49.
Fits, 86.

General debility, 140, 150.
Gout, 10, 62, 63, 107.

Hepatic and other derangements, 115, 116, 140, 141.
Hip complaints, 146, 147, 148, 149, 173.

Indigestion, &c., 157.
Inflammation, 2, 7, 20, 21, 22, 27, 64, 95, 201.
———— of the brain, 173.
Influenza, 169.
Insanity, 10, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84.

Liver complaints, 10, 139, 149.
Locked-jaw, 74.
Loss of sight and hearing, 73, 74, 164, 165.
Lumbago, 103.

Meazles, 97.

Pains in the head, &c., 109, 110, 111, 151, 177, 194, 195.
Palpitation of the heart, 106.
Paralysis, 71, 72, 77.

Quinsy, 153, 154.

Rheumatism, 174, 175, 176.
Ringworm, &c., 74.
Rot in sheep, 58, 59.

Scrofula, 10.
Small-pox, 10, 19, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.
Spinal complaints, 10, 61, 62, 121, 122, 157, 158.
Swelled joints, 65, 96, 102, 145, 178, 179.

Tic douloureux, 74, 77.
Tubercle of the lungs, 10.

Ulcers, 65, 189, 190.
Ulcerated sore throat, &c., 112, 113, 120, 128, 129, 131, 132, 140, 151, 155, 156, 191, 192, 193.

Water on the brain, 44, 45, 72, 73.

INDEX TO THE PATIENTS AND OTHERS WHO TESTIFY AS TO THE PROPERTIES OF MR. LONG'S REMEDIES.

William Abington, Esq., *East India House*, 32, 82, 93, 190, 191, 192.

W. A. B. Abington, Esq., Barrister-at-law, *Marlborough Cottage, Park Village, Regent's Park*, 34.

John Adolphus, Esq., Barrister-at-law, *Gower Street*, 32, 85, 86, 87, 88, 101, 102.

R. Alexander, Esq., *Standard Office, Liverpool*, 33.

T. J. Alexander, Esq., *Standard Office, Liverpool*, 102, 103.

Lady Ashworth, 3, *Hall Place, St. John's Wood*, 31, 92, 112, 113, 151, 152, 153.

George Atkinson, Esq. *Queen's Coll., Oxon*, 34, 115.

William Barron, Esq. 94.

William Barrows, Esq., *Cheltenham*, 33.

Henry Barry, Esq., *Cheltenham*, 33, 100.

The Rev. Dr. Samuel Blacker, *Mullybrack, Market Hill, Ireland*, 32, 98, 99.

Reginald J. Blewitt, Esq., *Monmouth*, 32, 93, 188, 189, 190.

Captain J. Bourne, R.N., 32.

Captain H. Bourne, R.N., 94, 96, 97.

John Braithwaite, Esq., *Bath Place, New Road*, 32, 94, 192, 193.

John Thomas Bridges, Esq., *Walmer, Deal, Kent*, 32, 114.

P. W. Browne, Esq., *Castle Brown, Co. Kildare*, 31, 95.

George Evans Bruce, Esq., *Wilton Crescent, Belgrave Square*, 33, 107.

The Countess of Buckinghamshire, *Montague Square*, 34, 141, 142.

Robert Burke, Esq., *Kildare Street, Dublin*, 32, 93, 95, 99, 100.

Miss Jane Bury, *Cheltenham*, 34, 93, 131, 132.

Lady Harriett Butler, 31, 94.

Lieut. Col. Campbell, R. A., *Woolwich*, 31, 146, 147, 148, 149.

Jane Campbell, *Woolwich*, 32, 92.

Margaret Chaigneau, *Lower Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin*, 33.

C. J. Christian, Esq., *Blandford Place, Regent's Park*, 34.

M. F. Christian, (now Mrs. Thompson,) *Blandford Place, Regent's Park*, 32, 93, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184.

Holland Coham, Esq., *Dunsland, Okehampton, Devon*, 33, 174, 175, 176.

J. W. Coke, Esq., *Longford, Derby*, 32, 94, 96.

M. Colville, *Bryanstone Square*, 33, 95.

William Conway, Esq., 8, *North Street, Manchester Square*, 32, 93, 166, 167, 172, 173.

Ellen Costin, 37, *Queen's Square*, 150.

Lord Dartmouth, 81.

John Day, Esq., 25, *City Terrace, City Road*, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172.

E. Denza, *Palermo*, 82.

G. Denza, *Palermo*, 137.

Mary Dutton, *Hastings*, 94.

S. Dutton, *Hastings*, 32.

John T. Evans, Esq., 139.

A. Fleming, Esq., *Greenville, Waterford*, 34, 115.

Jane A. G. Fortye, *Guernsey*, 32, 93, 127, 128.

Charles L. Francis, Esq., *Vauxhall*, 33, 114.

Thomas Fussell, Esq., *Mills Frome, Somerset*, 32, 93, 115, 116.

Signor D. Galloni, *Corfu*, 149.

R. F. Gambier, Esq., R. N., *Portland Place*, 31, 94.

Colonel Gibbs, (Aide-de-camp to the King,) *Albany*, 33, 83, 100.

Ellen Gregory, *Shacklewell*, 32, 93.

A. Grimes, Esq., *Yafford House, Isle of Wight*, 34.

Maria Grindlay, 30, *North Bank, Regent's Park*, 93, 140, 141.

A. M. M. Grindlay, *North Bank, Regent's Park*, 32, 105.

R. Grindlay, Esq., *North Bank, Regent's Park*, 34, 139, 140.

E. C. Lloyd Hall, Esq., Barrister-at-law, *Fig Tree Court, Temple*, 31, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166.

John Hambrough, Esq., *Steephill Castle, Isle of Wight*, 33, 114.

Lord Harewood, 81.

Viscount Harris, 31, 98.

Edward Tulk Hart, 19, *Duke Street, Westminster*, 32, 94.

Captain W. Haughton, R.N., 31.

Henry Pelham Heneage, Esq., *Grafton Street*, 34, 113.

A. Hill, Esq., *Donnybrook, Doneraile, Ireland*, 33, 108.

William Hodges, Esq., Barrister-at-law, *Temple*, 32, 82, 93.

Captain H. Houghton, R.N., *Park Place Paddington*, 82, 93, 106.

Lord Howe, 81.

Viscount Ingestrie, 5, *Mansfield Street, London*, 31, 81, 82, 88, 89, 91, 93, 142, 143.

J. Johnson, 34, *Montague Square*, 136.

M. Caulfield J. Irvine, Esq., *Bellevue House, Youghall*, 34, 177.

Lady H. Kavanagh, 31, 111, 112.

Sir Thomas Lawrence, R. A., 81.

Captain P. Le Mesurier, 17, *Charles Street*, 145.

Captain C. A. Lewis, *Queen's Bays*, 34, 100.

Colonel Lloyd, 34, 178, 179.

A. M. Lownds, Esq., 23, *Hans Place, Sloane Street*, 33, 94.

Dr. Macarthney, M.D., *Enniscorthy, Ireland*, 34, 129, 130, 131.

Helen Macdonald, *Bensham Lodge, Croydon, Surrey*, 33, 34, 96, 153, 154.

J. Macdonald Esq., *Bensham Lodge, Croydon, Surrey*, 93.

Jane Macdougall, *Guernsey*, 32, 92, 97, 98.

Colonel Macneil, 34, *Montague Square*, 138.

George Manley, (for his infant daughter,) *Holywell Street, Strand*, 33, 93, 134, 135.

Major General Mawby, *Baker Street, Portman Square*, 32, 110, 111.

T. Montgomery, Esq., *Beech Hill, Antrim, Ireland*, 31, 94.

Captain Henry Musters, (*Grenadier Guards*), 33, 94.

Lieutenant General Neville, R.A., *Sutton Cottage, Hounslow*, 31, 107.

James O'Brien, Esq., *Limerick*, 136, 137.

Peter O'Brien, Esq., *Limerick*, 33, 83, 119, 120, 121.

Miss M. J. O'Connor, (*of Dublin*,) *Bentinck Street, Manchester Square*, 34, 113.

The Marquis of Ormonde, 31, 98.

The Marchioness of Ormonde, 31, 93, 95, 151, 157, 194, 195, 196.

The Rev. Samuel O'Sullivan, *Phœnix Park, Dublin*, 32, 117, 118, 119.

S. Ottley, *Devonshire Street*, 93.

Samuel Oughton, Esq., *New High Street, Manchester*, 32, 82, 133, 138.

James Harwick Oughton, Esq., *Elm Grove, Roehampton*, 33, 104, 105.

Catherine Oughton, *Elm Grove, Roehampton*, 33, 157.

S. H. Oughton, Esq., *Marsden Square, Manchester*, 92.

Harriett Page, *Meeting Street, Ramsgate*, 32, 93, 143, 150.

John Pemberton, Esq., (*Mayor of Hertford*,) 33, 133, 134.

R. Potter, Esq., (late Surgeon-general of Jamaica,) *Bloomsbury Place, Brighton*, 34, 185, 186, 187.

M. G. Prendergast, Esq., M.P., *George Street, Hanover Square*, 31, 93, 108, 109, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209.

Rosetta Prendergast, *George Street, Hanover Square*, 32, 93.

F. H. Ramadge, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, *Ely Place*, 34, 122, 123, 124, 125.

Henry Ravenhill, Esq., *Clapham Common*, 33, 100, 157, 158, 159.

William Ravenhill, Esq., *Clapham Common*, 33, 100.

Caroline Rooke, 3, *Hall Place, St. John's Wood*, 31, 92.

A. Sanders, Esq., 94.

Frederick Sargent, Esq., *Treasury, Whitehall*, 34.

General Sharpe, M.P., *Haddam Castle, Dumfries*, 34, 187, 188.

Mrs. Sharpe, *Haddam Castle, Dumfries*, 34.

Lieutenant Colonel Shawe, *Dublin Castle*, 31, 103, 104.

Emma Shew, *Weymouth Street, London*, 33, 103.

Major General Shortall, R.A., *Phœnix Park, Dublin*, 31, 83, 100, 109, 110.

The Marquis of Sligo, 32, 95, 126, 127.

Miss P. Smythe, *Ballinatray, Youghall, Ireland*, 34, 196, 197, 198.

Lieutenant Colonel Spottiswoode, *Gladswood, Melrose, N. B.*, 31, 101.

J. Spottiswoode, Esq., *George Street, Westminster, of Spottiswoode, Lauder, N. B.*, 31, 93, 155, 156.

The Rev. Richard Stewart, (*Rector of Kildress, County Tyrone*,) 32, 93, 121, 122.

S. Southeby, 7, *Charlotte Street, Bloomsbury*, 32, 39.

T. F. Taylor, Esq., *Enfield, Middlesex*, 34, 125, 126.

Amelia Thompson, *Blandford Place*, 34, 115.

J. T. Thompson, Esq., 32, 83, 94, 106.

Jane R. Turnley, *Brockport, Holywood, Belfast*, 33, 99.

Louis Vercellini, 13, *North Bank, Regent's Park*, 93.

S. Vercellini, *North Bank, Regent's Park*, 32.

Major James G. Waddall, *Devonshire Street, London*, 33, 93.

Colonel Watson, R.A., *Woolwich*, 31, 100, 128, 129.

Sarah Webb, (late Enticnap) *Cheddingfold, Godalming, Surrey*, 33, 116, 117.

Lady Whale, *Harley Street*, 34.

G. W. Wildgress, Esq., 57, *Harley Street*, 34, 115.

THE END.

PRINTED BY RICHARD TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.